THE

PUBLICATIONS

OF THE

Selden Society

περὶ παντὸς τὴν ἐλευθερίαν

VOLUME XIII

FOR THE YEAR 1899

Selden Society

Founded 1887

TO ENCOURAGE THE STUDY AND ADVANCE THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE HISTORY OF ENGLISH LAW.

Select Pleas of the Forest

Selden Society

SELECT PLEAS OF THE FOREST

EDITED
FOR THE SELDEN SOCIETY
BY
G. J. TURNER, M.A.
OF LINCOLN'S INN, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

LONDON
BERNARD QUARITCH, 15 PICCADILLY
1901

PREFACE

The text of this volume consists for the most part of extracts from the eyre rolls of the tenth year of the reign of John and of the latter half of the reign of Henry III. The rest consists of forest inquisitions, upon which some of the eyre rolls printed in this volume were based, some perambulations of the reign of Edward I. and a few other miscellaneous documents. The MSS. relating to Essex (pp. 69–74) are in the British Museum; all the others are in the Public Record Office.

The Introduction is confined to a description of the forest laws of the thirteenth century; and it has been found impossible to deal with every branch of them, even within this limited period. No documents explaining the rights of common enjoyed by the inhabitants of the forests are printed in this volume, nor is any account given of them in the Introduction. Common is a large subject, and in the judgment of the editor it is not convenient to treat common in forests apart from common elsewhere.

The Glossary includes words used in documents relating to the forest administration even though they are not mentioned in the text of this volume. Numerous examples are printed in it which illustrate the use and purpose of the hounds used in the middle ages, but an attempt to show their relation to hounds of modern times is deemed to lie outside the scope of this work.

The editor has to thank Mr. J. H. Willis for a valuable note on one of the words mentioned in the Glossary; Mr. Henry Bradley, of Exeter College, Oxford, and Mr. Victor Kastner, professor of the French

Language in Owens College, Manchester, for advice about the French text printed on pp. 125-128; Mr. R. B. Turton, of the Inner Temple, who read the greater part of the text in proof, for many useful suggestions; Miss K. S. Martin for assistance in collating the text and for the verification of most of the dates and references in the book; and Miss E. M. Samson for compiling the Index of Matters.

The assistance of the Literary Director and the Hon. Secretary has been invaluable; and the latter has devoted more time and attention to this volume than the Society or its editor could have hoped to secure. During the unfortunate illness of the Literary Director, Mr. C. E. H. Chadwyck Healey very kindly acted in his stead.

The labour of endeavouring to recover from the plea rolls a branch of law of which little has been known for a long time past has not been inconsiderable; and the editor hopes that, if his efforts have been successful, the delay that has thus been occasioned will not be regretted by members of the Society. The volume should have appeared in 1899, and represents that year in the Society's Publications.

July 1901.

Note.—In the king's Chancery of the thirteenth century the letter *v* was used to represent the initial letter *u*, even when the initial had a vowel sound. Thus the clerks of the Chancery wrote 'vt,' 'vnum' and 'vnde.' In the middle of a word they used the letter *u*, even when it had a consonantal sound. The clerks of the Exchequer and the two Benches used the letters *u* and *v* in the same fashion. Elsewhere, however, the letter *v* was occasionally used in the middle of a word. This was the case in the forest eyre rolls; and as it is of some interest to notice how far the spelling of the clerks who enrolled forest proceedings differed from that of the clerks of the Chancery, the exact use of the letters *u* and *v* has been followed in the text printed in this volume. As the documents quoted in the Introduction are short and are derived from various sources, little information can be obtained from them about the use of the letters *u* and *v*. For this reason the letter *u* is printed in the Latin documents quoted in the Introduction, even when it is represented in the original by the letter *v*.

CONTENTS

INQUISITIONS.

PLEAS OF THE WARREN.

INTRODUCTION.

THE FORESTS IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

I.

THE FOREST AND THE BEASTS OF THE FOREST.

In mediæval England a forest[1] was a definite tract of land within which a particular body of law was enforced, having for its object the preservation of certain animals *ferae naturae*. Most of the forests were the property of the Crown, but from time to time the kings alienated some of them to their subjects. Thus the forest of Pickering[2] in Yorkshire and all those in the county of Lancaster were in the fourteenth century held by the Earls of Lancaster, who enforced[3] the forest laws over them just as the king did in his own forests. But although the king or a subject might be seised of a forest, he was not necessarily seised of all the land which it comprised. Other persons might

[1] The word forest is often used in official documents of the middle ages in the singular where according to modern usage the plural would be expected. Thus, the usual expression is 'justice of the forest south of Trent' instead of 'justice of the forests south of Trent.'

[2] The Great Cowcher Book of the Duchy of Lancaster contains transcripts of pleas of the forests of Lancaster and Pickering at forest eyres held in 8 Ed. iii. The proceedings there transcribed show conclusively that the full body of the forest laws was enforced in the forests of Henry earl of Lancaster. The reference to the Cowcher Book is *Duchy of Lancaster Miscellaneous Book, No.* 1.

[3] The privileges which the Earls of Lancaster enjoyed in these forests were exceptional. See p. cxii below.

possess lands within the bounds of a forest, but were not allowed the right of hunting or of cutting trees in them at their own will.

The history of the English forests may conveniently be divided into three periods, of which the first extended from the earliest times till 1217, the year of the granting of the Charter of the Forest; the second from 1217 till 1301, when large tracts were disafforested by king Edward I.; and the third from 1301 till the present day. This volume is concerned chiefly with the second of these periods; for until this has been studied in detail it will be impossible, owing to lack of documents to do more than make conjectures about the earlier period; and after 1301 the whole forest administration was from various causes in a state of decay.

In the forests the red deer and the fallow deer were strictly preserved,[1] as were also certain other animals; but to ascertain which these were will require some consideration. Manwood in his 'Treatise on the Forest Laws,' which was written [2] at the end of the sixteenth century, declared that there were five beasts of the forest, the hart, the hind, the hare, the wild boar and the wolf: in other words, the red deer, the hare, the wild boar and the wolf, the hart and the hind being respectively the male and female of the red deer. But although Manwood did not include the fallow deer in the class of beasts of the forest, he inserted it in another class with the fox, the marten and the roe, which he called beasts [3] of the chase. The law, however, recognised no such distinction between the red deer and the fallow deer; for if the words 'beasts of the forest' have any legal significance, they must refer to those beasts which are the particular subject of the forest laws, and as the laws relating to the red deer were precisely the same as those relating to the fallow deer, both species ought to be placed in the same class.

Again, Manwood's exclusion of the roe from the beasts of the forest, although true in his own time, was not true of the period under our consideration. During the thirteenth century the roe was the subject of the forest laws in all parts of England. But in the thirteenth year of the reign of Edward III. the court of the King's Bench decided [4] that the roe was not a beast of the forest but of the

[1] The two principal legal incidents which attached to a beast of the forest were that if it were found dead an inquisition was held upon it by four neighbouring townships; and if a trespasser was convicted of killing it, he was adjudged to prison at the forest eyre, from which he was released on payment of a sum of money by way of ransom.

[2] The first edition appeared in 1598, a second in 1599, and a third, much enlarged, in 1615.

[3] As to the beasts of the chase see p. cxiv below.

[4] Coram Rege Rolls 315, Rot. 106; Patent Roll 197, m. 17.

warren, on the ground that it drove away the other deer. The circumstances in which this decision was given and its terms deserve notice. In the forest eyre of 12 Ed. III. Henry de Percy put forward a claim to have woodwards carrying bows and arrows in his woods in his manor of Seamer, which was within the forest of Pickering, and also to have the right of hunting and taking roes, as well within the covert of the forest as outside. The Earl of Lancaster, to whom the king had granted the forest and all his rights over it, opposed the latter of these claims on the ground that the roe was a beast of the forest, and that the right demanded was against the assize of the forest. It must here be observed that it was not uncommon for the king to make grants of the right of hunting hares and foxes in his forests; and it may be presumed that the owner of a forest such as the Earl of Lancaster would do the same. So, too, certain forest officials claimed the right[1] of hunting the hare and the fox as appendant to their offices. There are, however, no instances of a right of hunting any kind of deer being exercised except by the king or the owner of a forest. No ordinance is extant which deals with the subject; but probably all that the Earl meant when he pleaded that the right demanded was against the assize of the forest was that it was without precedent and against policy. The justices in eyre adjourned the claim for consideration by the Court of King's Bench, which gave judgment as follows:

> Et super hoc uisis et examinatis clameis ac recordo et processu predictis et habito inde tractatu et diligenti deliberacione cum cancellario thesaurario iusticiariis et aliis de consilio domini regis, quod licet tempore domini Edwardi quondam regis Angl' aui domini regis nunc quo tempore predicta foresta fuit in manu ipsius aui domini regis nunc transgressores, qui conuicti erant de capcione capriolorum, fecerunt finem ut pro transgressione uenacionis foreste, prout per recordum predicti Willelmi de Uescy et sociorum suorum est compertum, uidetur tamen iusticiariis hic et consilio domini regis quod caprioli sunt bestie de warenna et non de foresta eo quod fugant alias feras de foresta.

Thus the roe ceased to be a beast of the forest in consequence of a kind of judicial ordinance, a decision given after consultation with the great officers of state, based, not upon precedent or analogy, but upon the broad ground of practical convenience.

The remaining beast of the forest was the wild boar,[2] which was

[1] See p. 67 below.

[2] The following is an example of the boar being treated as a beast of the forest; it is taken from the Gloucester eyre rolls of January 1258:

'Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum

already scarce in the thirteenth century. Entries on the forest eyre rolls show that it belonged to the same class of animals as the red deer, the fallow deer and the roe; but such entries occur seldom, and in many of the rolls of the great eyre, which began in 1256 and extended over many counties, the wild boar is not mentioned at all.[1]

But besides omitting one animal from his list of beasts of the forest, Manwood wrongly inserted two others. The hare should have no place in his list of such beasts. If we look through the rolls of the forests, we find that, except in a few special instances, the hare was not preserved by the forest laws. It is true that it enjoyed a certain measure of protection by reason of the assize,[2] which prohibited greyhounds and dogs from being brought within the forest, but this protection was a mere incident of the assize, which was enacted for the preservation of other animals. Nevertheless the forest rolls show that the hare was undoubtedly preserved in one forest, in which it was the subject of the same laws as the deer of different species, and the wild boar. This forest was the warren [3] of Somerton, within the boundaries of which the king specially preserved the hare as a beast of the forest. It is impossible that an animal so common throughout England could be preserved elsewhere without some mention of it being found in the forest rolls. Moreover, except in districts of small area, its preservation would have been an intolerable burden to the country. For example, one of the forest laws required that, whenever a beast of the forest was found dead or wounded an inquest forthwith should be held upon it by four neighbouring townships; and records of such inquests in the warren of Somerton still exist. To

quod in uigilia sancti Uincencii anno quadragesimo quidam aper inuentus fuit occisus in balliua de Blakeneye. Inquisicio inde facta fuit per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, scilicet, Lydeney, Ettelou', Aylbriston' et Aluynton' que dicunt quod Iohannes le Uilayn de Blakeneye dictum aprum occidit; qui non uenit nec fuit attachiatus quia mortuus; ideo nichil de eo. Et quia dicte uillate non uenerunt plenarie etc.; ideo in misericordia.' (*Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 28, *Roll* 4 d.)

Another example occurs on the rolls of the same eyre:

'Presentatum est per forestarios et uiridarios et conuictum quod Reginaldus Yolewe et Walterus Wytenot occiderunt unum porcum in foresta de Dene; super quem capti fuerunt et missi apud Glouc' ad imprisonandum, et modo non ueniunt.' (Ibid. *Roll* 4.)

Pleas of the forest were divided into two classes, those relating to the vert and those relating to the venison. The word venison was applied to the beasts of the forest. There is evidence apart from the rolls of forest pleas, that the word included the wild boar as well as the red and fallow deer and the roe. On 29 October 1225 two hunters were sent into the forest of Dean to take twelve boars for the king's use. On the following day a writ was sent to the constable of St. Briavels with respect to venison taken by these hunters. (*Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum*, vol. ii. p. 84.) Again, in some letters close of 1 November 1226, we have the words, 'decima uenacionis de porcis.' (Ibid. 157.)

[1] See pp. l and lv below.

[2] By the assize of Woodstock, which is attributed to the year 1184, people were forbidden to have greyhounds in the forest. (*Gesta Henrici*, Rolls Series, vol. ii. p. clxi.)

[3] See pp. 41, 42, 43 below.

make such a law apply to the hare throughout the length and breadth of the vast forests of the thirteenth century would have been absurd.

Again, Manwood's inclusion of the wolf in the class of beasts of the forest was entirely unwarranted. The wolf is seldom mentioned in any of our public records; and the passages in which we meet with it do not support his statement. From the thirteenth year [1] of the reign of Henry II., a hunter received an annual allowance, charged upon the sheriff's farm, for hunting wolves in the county of Worcester. In a suit [2] in the king's court at Westminster in 1225 the tenant pleaded that he held the lands demanded by the service of catching wolves in the king's forest. By a charter [3] dated 6 March 123$\frac{8}{9}$ the king granted to John of Lexington the right of hunting and taking in all the royal forest in the county of Nottingham, except the demesne warrens, the fox, the wolf, the hare and the cat. By letters patent [4] dated 14 May 1281, the king directed Peter Corbet to take and destroy all wolves in the counties of Gloucester, Worcester, Hereford, Salop and Stafford. In short, the wolf, so far from being in any way preserved, was treated as a noxious beast which ought to be exterminated.

Thus it may be confidently asserted that there were in general four beasts of the forest, and four only, the red deer, the fallow deer, the roe and the wild boar, the only exception being that in a few districts the hare was also made the subject of the forest laws. Occasionally, however, we may meet with passages in official documents which, if not considered carefully, might suggest that there were in some cases less than four beasts of the forest. For example, in a charter [5] of the year 1212, by which king John granted to the prior and monks of Lenton a tenth part of all his venison taken in the counties of Nottingham and Derby, the word *uenacio*, or venison, which in the middle ages was applied to the beasts of the forest, is defined as the red deer, the fallow deer and the wild boar. Here the omission of the roe might suggest that this animal was not considered as a beast of the forest in all counties. It is unfortunate that no documents still exist which relate to the forests in Nottingham and Derby in the reign of Henry III. or his predecessors. But if the

[1] See *Publications of the Pipe Roll Society*, vol. xi. p. 64.

[2] Maitland's *Bracton's Note Book*, vol. iii. p. 518.

[3] Charter Roll 33, m. 5.

[4] Patent Roll 99, m. 20. In some letters patent dated 23 May 1281 on the same roll (m. 19), the following passage occurs with reference to a wood in Gloucestershire: 'Ac pro eo quod tam lupi quam malefactores foreste frequenter ibidem accedunt et morantur propter densitatem eiusdem subbosci.' See also the word 'Lupus' in the Glossary to this volume.

[5] *Rotuli Chartarum*, p. 189 *b*.

rolls of the Nottingham forest eyre of 15 Ed. I. be searched, it will be found that in one case[1] the roe does appear as a beast of the forest. But as this is a single case we may infer that the roe was not common in the county.[2] Its absence from the words defining venison in the charter of 1212 may therefore be explained by its scarcity, the draftsman of the charter probably omitting it because he was under the impression that it was not found in the counties of Nottingham and Derby, rather than with the express intention of excluding it.

It must, however, be conceded that although the roe was a beast of the forest it was not always looked upon with favour even by the king. Thus in a charter[3] of liberties granted to the Abbey of Abingdon, king Richard I. allowed the monks to take all roes which they could find in a certain district, but not harts and hinds, without his licence. Other evidence[4] could be adduced to the same effect, but it is not inconsistent with the roe being a beast of the forest, as to which the evidence of the eyre rolls is conclusive.

II.

THE FOREST OFFICERS.

The Justices.

For the purpose of forest administration England was divided into two provinces, one of which lay to the north, the other to the south of the river Trent. This division[5] was made in the year 1238, when

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 127, *Roll* 1.

[2] Of this we have some further evidence from a memorandum on the same rolls which states that three hundred and fifty harts, hinds, bucks, does, and prickets died of murrain in the fourteenth year of Edward i., but which says nothing of roes. (*Ibidem, Roll* 5 *in dorso.*)

[3] The grant was by a charter dated 29 March 1190, of which an inspeximus is enrolled on the Charter Roll of 10 Ed. iii. The words of the charter which confer the liberty are as follows: 'Et omnes capreolos, quos ibi inuenire poterunt, accipiant et ceruos et ceruas non accipiant nisi nostra licencia.' (Charter Roll 131, Ent. 30.)

[4] Although the roe in the thirteenth century was a beast of the forest and not a beast of the warren, king John granted to William Picot by a charter dated 14 April 1209 free warren of roes. Thus: 'Sciatis nos dedisse et concessisse et per cartam nostram confirmasse Willelmo Picot liberam warennam de cheuerellis et leporibus et cuniculis et fesantis et perdicibus in terra sua de Dudinton' et de Torp' quam longe lateque terra illa se extendit, ita quod nemo in ea capiat cheuerellum uel leporem uel cuniculos uel fesantos uel perdices sine assensu suo et licencia sua super forisfacturam decem librarum' (*Rotuli Chartarum*, p. 185).

A grant of warren of roes was, however, exceptional.

[5] On 22 May 1238, John Biset was appointed justice of the forest south of the Trent. (See Patent Roll 47, m. 6.) Robert of Ros had been appointed justice of the forest in the counties of Nottingham, Derby, Yorkshire, Lancaster,

a justice of the forest was appointed for each province. Before that date, although there had more than once been two such justices, to each of whom was assigned a particular group of counties, there was usually one only,[1] the 'Capitalis Forestarius'[2] of the Charter. The business of the justices was ministerial rather than judicial. They were not required by virtue of their office to be present either in person or by deputy at any of the forest courts; but the king as a general rule included them in commissions[3] to justices to hear and determine forest pleas. At the beginning of the fourteenth century, although there was no sudden change in their duties, they ceased to be described in the king's Chancery as justices, and received instead the less distinguished designation of wardens, which continued in use until the reign of Richard II., when the title of justice was again revived.

One of their principal ministerial duties was to release on bail prisoners who were detained in custody for offences in the royal forests. This was no light work: any poacher caught in the act of killing a deer, or with venison in his possession, was forthwith sent to prison, from which he could only be released on an order from the justice of the forest or from the king himself. But besides this and other special duties of a similar character, they supervised the whole forest administration, held special inquisitions on the expediency of proposed royal grants of liberties, and in general carried out all the executive work relating to the forests.

The justices of the forest occasionally in the thirteenth century and frequently in the fourteenth century performed their duties by deputy. In the reign of Edward III. it was the practice for general inquisitions concerning the state of the forest to be held before the justices or their deputies,[4] who were styled lieutenants of the justice. As a rule the deputy seems to have been appointed by the justice; but there are cases in which the appointment was made by the king.

Northumberland and Cumberland by letters patent dated 27 November 1236. (Patent Roll 46, m. 12.)

Brian de l'Isle had been appointed in October 1229 justice of the forest in the counties of Northumberland, Cumberland, York, Lancaster, Nottingham, Derby, Lincoln, Leicester, Rutland, Northampton, Buckingham, Essex, Cambridge, Huntingdon and Oxford except the bailiwick of Thomas of Langley; and John of Monmouth was at the same time appointed justice of the forest in the counties of Stafford, Salop, Worcester, Warwick, Gloucester, Hereford, Devon, Somerset, Dorset, Southampton, Wiltshire, Berkshire and Surrey, and in the bailiwick of Thomas of Langley in Oxfordshire. (See Patent Roll 37, m. 2.)

[1] The justices of the forest were sometimes styled 'Protoforestarii.' Mathew Paris (*Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, vol. iv.), for instance, so describes John Biset (p. 88); but he also calls him 'summus Anglie forestarius' (*ibid.*), and 'summus iusticiarius foreste' (p. 174).

[2] Mentioned in Chapter 16 of the Charter.

[3] See p. lvii below.

[4] See, for example, p. xlix below.

Thus Henry III. appointed[1] Roger of Lancaster deputy for Roger of Leyburn, the justice of the forest north of the Trent, by letters patent dated the 25th October 1265, during the pleasure of the king and Roger of Leyburn himself.

The justices[2] were usually men of considerable political standing. John[3] fitz-Geoffrey, Robert Passelewe and Robert Walerand, for example, all left their mark on English history, independently of their administration of forest business. By the end of the fourteenth century the office evidently became a sinecure, being then usually held by a nobleman of high rank. But though a sinecure, the income attached to it was certainly not derived solely from an official salary, for from the close of the thirteenth century the justices of the forest south of the Trent received from the king an annual payment[4] of a hundred pounds only; and the salary of the justices of the forest north of the Trent was only two-thirds of that sum.

The Wardens.

Next in authority to the justices were the wardens of the forest. They were variously described in official documents, and seldom expressly as wardens; but the word may conveniently be used to avoid ambiguity. Usually a warden had the custody of a single forest, but in some cases he had the charge of a group of forests lying apart from one another. Thus in the year 1300 Sabine[5]

[1] Roger of Leyburn was appointed justice of the forest north of the Trent by letters patent dated 25 October 1265. (See Patent Roll 82, m. 3.) On the same day Roger of Lancaster was appointed his deputy. (See same roll, m. 2.) In the letters patent dated 1 August 1270 by which Geoffrey de Neville was appointed justice of the forest north of the Trent, Roger of Lancaster is described as steward of the forest (see Fine Roll 67, m. 5).

[2] A complete list of justices of the forest south of the Trent, with the dates of the letters patent appointing them, will be published in one of the forthcoming numbers of the *English Historical Review*.

[3] The appointments of John fitz-Geoffrey and Robert Passelewe are not recorded upon the Patent Rolls. Robert Walerand was appointed 'steward' of the king's forest south of the Trent by letters patent dated 1 September 1256. (See Patent Roll 67, m. 3.) Nevertheless the same letters patent direct the ministers of the forest to be intendent and respondent to him as to a justice of the forest. He is the only justice who is described as steward in letters patent of appointment. In other documents he is described as 'justice of the forest.'

[4] Roger l'Estrange, who was appointed justice of the forest south of the Trent by letters patent dated 21 October 1283 (see Patent Roll, 101 m. 5), received an annual fee of 100*l*. (See Liberate Rolls 542, 543, 544 and 545.)

Geoffrey de Neville, who was appointed justice of the forest north of the Trent by letters patent dated 1 August 1270 (see Fine Roll 67, m. 5), received an annual fee of one hundred marks. (See Liberate Roll, 537, m. 3.)

The letters patent appointing a justice usually state that he is to take the same salary as his predecessors in the office.

[5] See *For. Proc., Ancient Chancery, No.* 102, m. 9. Her five forests were Mendip, Selwood, North Pedderton, Nerroche and Exmore.

Pecche was the warden of five forests, all situate in different parts of the county of Somerset. Similarly all the forests in the counties of Northampton, Huntingdon, Oxford and Buckingham were grouped together and subject to a common warden, who was styled the warden or steward of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford. These forests, it is true, were in places contiguous to one another; but each of them had its own name and for many purposes was treated as a distinct forest bailiwick.

There were two classes of wardens: the one appointed by letters patent under the great seal, holding office during the king's pleasure; the other hereditary wardens. When the king appointed a warden by letters patent, he usually appointed him at the same time the warden of a particular castle within the forest. Thus the warden of the castle of Rockingham and the warden of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford were usually the same person, who was appointed to both offices by the same letters patent.

The hereditary wardens were liable to lose their offices for misconduct. Robert of Everingham, for example, was removed [1] from his office in the year 1287 as a punishment for committing various grave offences, including the appropriation of the king's deer to his own use. On the other hand, Peter de Neville, in spite of the shameful conduct of which he was convicted [2] in the forest eyre of the year 1269, remained in possession [3] of his office. In general, as might have been expected, there was more irregularity and oppression in the forests where there was an hereditary warden than in those where the wardens held office during the king's pleasure.

Misleading titles were often applied to the wardens, such as steward, bailiff, or chief forester. In letters patent the king is usually expressed to have granted the wardenship of a forest to the person appointed, who in consequence may appropriately be described as a warden. On the other hand, the wardens are often described on the forest eyre rolls as 'stewards.' Thus John Mansel, to whom the king granted the wardenship [4] of the forests between the bridges of

[1] See p. 67 below.

[2] See pp. 44 to 53 below.

[3] By letters close dated 17 November 1269, the king directed the justice of the forest to deliver to Peter de Neville his bailiwick of Rutland which had been taken into the king's hand, the said Peter having found sureties to answer for his trespass. (See Close Roll 91, m. 12.) It is probable that he committed other offences in the forest, for on 1 February 127$\frac{2}{3}$, an order was sent to admit him to bail to answer for trespasses in Rutland forest. (See Close Roll 95, m. 10.) On Thursday 26 April 1274 sentence of outlawry was promulgated against him, for an offence committed on 7 October 1273. (See Inq. post mortem, 3 Ed. i., No. 64.)

On 13 September 1300, the king granted the custody of the forest of Rutland to Theobald, the son of Peter de Neville. (See Patent Roll 119, m. 7.)

[4] See note 5, p. 13 below.

Stamford and Oxford by letters patent dated 22 October 1252, was described [1] on the eyre rolls of 1255 as 'chief steward of the forest'; and other wardens are elsewhere described as 'stewards' without even the addition of the word 'chief.' Unfortunately, the title 'steward,' which, if it had been applied solely to wardens, could have caused no ambiguity, was often applied to persons who were not wardens. Thus Geoffrey of Childwick [2] and Geoffrey de Mortemer [3] are respectively described on the Huntingdon eyre rolls as stewards of the forest; and William of Northampton [4] is similarly described in the Northampton eyre rolls of the same year. Now it is quite certain that none of these people were wardens of the forest, because a complete series of the wardens of this period can be compiled from the patent rolls which record the letters patent by which they were appointed. If, however, Geoffrey of Childwick and the other persons styled stewards were not wardens, they must have been deputy wardens called stewards for want of a better name. A few years later the word lieutenant, 'locum tenens,' came into use to describe their position. Adam of Nailford, for example, acted as deputy for Elias de Hauville,[5] who was warden of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford in the year 1292. In an inquisition [6] held in Rockingham forest on the 9th March 1294 Adam is described in one place as 'subsenescallus' or 'sub-steward,' and in another as 'locum tenens Elye de Hauuile.'

It was possible for a warden to assign his office, or a portion of his bailiwick, with the consent of the king. Thus Richard de Munfiquet, or de Munfichet,[7] granted the wardenship of the forest of Essex to Gilbert of Clare in the year 1267 with the king's consent. Again in 126$\frac{6}{7}$ Warin of Bassingbourn, who was then warden [8] of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford, granted the forest of Weybridge, which was part of his bailiwick, to Robert le Loup [9] for life, and the king on 20 February 126$\frac{6}{7}$ confirmed the grant by his letters patent. On 5 June 1275 Edward I. granted this then recently created bailiwick of the forest of Weybridge, which had become vacant, to a certain John of Fransham [10] for his life without the express consent of the warden of the forest between the two bridges; and

[1] See p. 13 below.
[2] See p. 14, note 8, below.
[3] See p. 22, note 4, below.
[4] See p. 31, note 6, below.
[5] Elias de Hauville was appointed warden of the castle of Rockingham and of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford by letters patent dated 10 March, 1292. (See Patent Roll 109, m. 17.)
[6] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 82, m. 5.
[7] Charter Roll 61, m. 5.
[8] See note 4, p. 40 below.
[9] See Patent Roll 84, m. 26.
[10] John of Fransham was appointed to the office by letters patent dated 5 June 1275. (See Patent Roll 93, m. 21.)

on the death of John of Fransham he granted it to John Pikard [1] for life without any such consent.

The wardens were the executive officers of the king in his forests. Writs relating to the administration of forest business, as well as to the delivery of presents of venison and wood, were, in general, addressed to them. They also attended the various courts of the forest. It does not appear, however, that their presence at any of them was necessary.

The Verderers.

The wardens were not the only officers of the forest in direct relation with the Crown. In all the forests, except those in the county palatine of Cheshire, there were officers called verderers [2] who were responsible to the king and not to the wardens. Like coroners, verderers were elected in the county court, the elections being made upon the receipt by the sheriff of a writ [3] called 'de uiridario eligendo.' When elected they held office for life unless they were removed by the Crown: an event which frequently happened in the fourteenth, but not often in the thirteenth century. The Close Rolls of the reign of Edward III. supply numerous examples of verderers being removed from their office, sometimes because they were incapacitated by age or illness, and at others because they were insufficiently qualified. The qualification was the possession of land within the forest, but it is probable that the particular quantity of land was not fixed, but lay in the discretion of the Crown. As a rule the verderers were either knights or persons possessed of considerable landed property. They received no salary, and no perquisites were attached to their office;

[1] John Pikard was appointed by letters patent dated 15 May 1276. (See Patent Roll 94, m. 23.)

[2] Verderers are seldom mentioned in documents of the early years of the reign of John. The first instance of the word 'uiridarius' in the charter rolls is in a charter dated 21 January 121$\frac{4}{5}$. (*Rotuli Chartarum*, p. 204.) If the word occurs at all in the charters or on the pipe rolls of the reign of Rich. i., it must be very rarely. It will be noticed that they are mentioned in the rolls of the eyre of 10 John (see pp. 3, 4, 7, 8), and in the Charter of the Forest, 1217, they are evidently an integral part of the forest hierarchy.

[3] The following is the form of the writ sent to the sheriff ordering an election:

'Rex uicecomiti Lincoln' etc. Quia N. de H. unus uiridariorum nostrorum foreste nostre de G. in comitatu predicto adeo languidus et senio contractus existit quod ad ea que ad officium uiridariorum in eadem foresta pertinent exercendum laborare non potest ut accepimus, tibi precipimus quod si ita est, tunc in pleno comitatu tuo de assensu eiusdem comitatus loco predicti N. eligi facias unum alium uiridarium, qui prestito sacramento prout moris est extunc ea faciat et conseruet que ad officium uiridarii pertinent in foresta predicta. Et talem eum eligi facias qui melius sciat et possit officio illi intendere. Et nomen eius nobis scire facias. Teste rege etc.' (*Registrum Omnium Brevium*, 1595, p. 177 v°.)

In the thirteenth century the king sometimes directed the warden of a forest to substitute a verderer for one discharged, instead of directing the sheriff to cause a new one to be elected. (See Close Roll 65, m. 8).

but some letters close[1] dated 1222, and addressed to the sheriff of Wiltshire show that by custom they were not liable to be put on assizes, recognitions and juries. Although the number of verderers in each forest varied, it was usually four; sometimes, however, a forest was divided into several bailiwicks, in each of which there were four verderers. Thus, there were four in each of the three bailiwicks in the forest[2] of Northumberland, and a similar arrangement prevailed in the forest[3] of Cumberland, which also comprised three bailiwicks. On the other hand, in Sherwood[4] forest the number of verderers was six. Finally, a few forests, among which may be noticed the forest of Rutland[5] and the warren of Somerton,[6] were considered too small to need more than two verderers.

The chief work in which the verderers were engaged was that of attending the forest courts.[7]

The Foresters.

All the ordinary work of the forests, such as watching for trespassers, pursuing them, attaching or arresting them—in short, all the work of a modern gamekeeper—was performed by a group of officers called foresters, whose numbers varied in different forests. In the Rutland forest eyre of 1269, it was proved that Peter de Neville, the warden, had under him many foresters with pages under them, to the damage and overburdening of the whole country. Accordingly, the justices directed that there should in future be no more than five walking foresters, one riding forester and a page, the number that of old there was wont to be. These foresters were not only

[1] The following is the text of the letters close: 'Rex uicecomiti Wiltes' salutem. Precipimus tibi quod non ponas uiridarios nostros de foresta nostra de Braden' in assisis recognicionibus uel iuratis quia secundum consuetudinem terre nostre poni non debent in assisis recognicionibus uel iuratis.' (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. p. 486.)

It seems from the following entry on the Close Roll of 32 Hen. iii., that the exemption did not extend to grand assizes: 'Mandatum est uicecomiti Berkes' quod non ponat G. P. et R. F. in aliquibus assisis preterquam in magnis assisis, si opus fuerit, quamdiu iidem G. et R. fuerint uiridarii regis in foresta regis de S.' (Close Roll 62, m. 8.)

[2] From the rolls of an eyre held at Newcastle on 22 April 1286, it appears that there were three bailiwicks in the forest of Northumberland. One lay to the south of the river Coquet, another between the rivers Coquet and Alne, and the third to the north of the river Alne. The same rolls show that there were twelve verderers in the whole forest. (See *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 125.)

[3] On the rolls of the eyre held at Cumberland in 13 Ed. i. thirty-six regarders are mentioned; of whom twelve made a regard in one bailiwick, and twelve in another. No regard made by the regarders of the third bailiwick is recorded on these eyre rolls. (*For Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 5.) The same rolls show that there were twelve verderers in the whole forest.

[4] See p. 61 below.

[5] See p. 43 below.

[6] See pp. 41, 42 below.

[7] See pp. xxvii to l below.

appointed by the wardens; they were also dependent upon them for their remuneration, for the Crown paid them no salaries. The wardenship of every forest which was held hereditarily carried with it, either by prescription or by express grant, certain rights [1] and privileges. Peter de Neville, for instance, was entitled [2] to due chiminage, lawing of dogs in places where it was due, and dead and dry wood which could be collected by the hand alone without any iron instrument in the demesne woods of the king. Robert of Everingham, the warden of Sherwood, enjoyed [3] among other things the right to have the bark and the crops of oaks which the king had given by his writ; the right to have after-pannage as often as it occurred, and the privilege of holding his ten knights' fees of the king in chief exonerated from service on account of his custody of the forest, and in return for finding his foresters at his own cost. But the wardens, although they enjoyed rights and privileges such as these, in order that they might maintain foresters under them, were so far from paying them anything that they themselves were actually paid by the foresters for allowing them to exercise their office. The foresters who thus paid an annual farm for their offices took their own remuneration from the inhabitants of the forests, by means of various acts of extortion [4] which they claimed as customary rights. Perhaps no better illustration of the oppression to which this system of farming the office of forester led could be found than the list of grievances [5] which the men

[1] These rights and privileges varied in different forests. Those which the warden of Sherwood enjoyed are set out in the inquisition printed on pp. 66, 67 below. From some letters close dated 2 September, 1315, we have the rights of the warden or steward of Galtres in Yorkshire They are as follows:

'[Compertum est] quod senescalli dicte foreste de Galtres, qui pro tempore fuerunt, tam temporibus progenitorum nostrorum quam nostro solebant ponere et deponere forestarios in foresta predicta pro uoluntate sua; et quod habere solebant de omnibus quercubus per dictos progenitores nostros aut nos datis tannam et ramos; et puturam suam in foresta predicta; et eciam duas landas que uocantur Hanterwayth' et Ercedekneclos reddendo inde annuatim dictis progenitoribus nostris et nobis quinque solidos per manus custodis eiusdem foreste; et insuper quod ad officium senescalli ibidem pertinet habere cheminagium et caplicium, reddendo inde nobis decem solidos per annum per manus custodis predicti; et quod habere solebant proficuum porcorum intrancium coopertam foreste predicte mense uetito, uidelicet, de quolibet porco unum obolum.' (Close Roll 138, m. 25.)

The warden of the forest of Galtres is in this passage called the steward of the forest, and the person who is described in it as the warden of the forest is the justice of the forest north of the Trent.

[2] See p. 46 below.

[3] See pp. 66, 67 below.

[4] Sometimes the foresters instead of extorting money from the inhabitants, wasted the king's woods. Thus on the rolls of the Stafford eyre of September 1271 we have the following entry:

'Presentatum est . . . . quod forestarii illi sepissime amouentur et alii in loco eorum ponuntur per senescallum qui capit ab unoquoque ad introitum suum magnam summam pecunie; et preter hoc certam summam certis terminis per annum, excepto fine facto ab unoquoque pro balliua sua tenenda nec habent forestarii unde hoc facere nisi de boscis balliuarum suarum.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 184, *Roll* 9 *d.*)

[5] See pp. 125 to 128 below.

of Somerset presented at an inquisition held in the year 1277. They complained of the chief forester or warden appointing more foresters than were necessary for looking after the forest, and of his taking from them money for appointing them; of the foresters coming in the month of August to collect corn from the inhabitants, of their making ale with the corn, which they then compelled the inhabitants to buy; of their collecting from them lambs and young pigs; and of their cutting down trees for fuel, and of taking chiminage where it was not due. It can hardly be doubted that extortion such as this was more resented by the masses of the people than the restrictions on hunting and woodcutting which constituted the main body of the forest laws. But even if the grievances of the men of Somerset were exceptional, they were the same in kind as those which people suffered in all the counties of England where the king had forests. Probably the best known article of the Charter of the Forest was the one which provided:

> Nullus forestarius uel bedellus de cetero faciat scotale uel colligat garbas uel auenam uel bladum aliud uel agnos uel porcellos nec aliquam collectam faciant; et per uisum et sacramentum duodecim reguardorum quando facient reguardum, tot forestarii ponantur ad forestas custodiendas quod ad illas custodiendas racionabiliter uiderint sufficere.

But it was a difficult article to enforce; and there was no better safeguard against the evils which it was intended to remove than an extensive disafforestment of the forests.

So when the commons demanded that the perambulations of the forest should be made in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the Forest, their demand was largely one for a curtailment of the districts over which extortion could be practised.

There were two kinds of foresters: those on horseback, or riding foresters, and those on foot, or walking foresters. The former were, of course, more burdensome to the inhabitants of the forests than the latter, but there was no rule as to how many foresters of each kind there should be in a forest. If, however, it appeared to the justices in eyre that there were too many, they gave directions, [1] as in the case of Peter de Neville, that the number should be reduced.

Some of the foresters also had grooms or pages under them, who accompanied them when they were keeping watch over the forest. They enjoyed no authority apart from their masters, to whom they were related much as a 'bulldog' is to a proctor in a university town.

[1] See p. 52 below.

The Foresters in Fee.

In most of the larger forests there were, in addition to the wardens, verderers and ordinary foresters, certain other officers, who were styled foresters in fee. It is impossible to describe even in general terms the conditions under which they held office, varying as those conditions did in different forests. All that the words 'forester in fee' necessarily connoted was a forester holding his office hereditarily. Thus Robert of Everingham, the hereditary warden of Sherwood Forest, is described [1] on the eyre rolls of 15 Ed. I., as a forester in fee. But when applied to him or to any other hereditary warden the words are embarrassing, as they were usually applied to hereditary foresters subordinate to a warden, and it is convenient to have a name for such officials.

Let us consider some examples. In the forest of Dean [2] there were eight or nine foresters in fee, each concerned with a particular district or bailiwick to the exclusion of his fellows, but all subordinate to the constable of St. Briavells, who was warden of the forest. As a body of officials, whose collective authority extended over the whole [3] forest, outnumbering the verderers, and independent of the warden, they must have possessed great influence in the management of forest business. In many of the forests there was no such body; there was, for example, none in Rutland. On the other hand, in certain forests there were foresters in fee who did not, as in the forest of Dean, constitute a special class, although they individually exercised a greater authority by reason of the magnitude of their bailiwicks. In the vast forest or group of forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford there were several foresters in fee. One had for his bailiwick the forest of Bernwood, another the forest of Whichwood. These were not the only forests between the two bridges; there were besides the forests of Rockingham, Cliffe, Salcey, Whittlewood and Huntingdon, in some of which there were no foresters in fee. Thus the foresters in fee in Bernwood and Whichwood, instead of having a coordinate authority which extended over a whole forest, were officials each of whom had the charge of one of a group of seven forests.

There is a question which forces itself upon our notice at this point, and must be considered. By whom were the foresters in fee

[1] See p. 61 below.

[2] In the perambulation of the forest of Dean made in the year 1300, nine foresters in fee and four verderers are mentioned. (*For. Proc., Anc. Chanc., No.* 102.)

[3] This appears to be the case from a brief investigation of the history of the forest of Dean.

originally enfeoffed? Was it by the king or by the wardens of the forest? The 'Red Book of the Exchequer' shows that there were men who held lands of the Crown in the time of king John by the service of guarding the forest. Sometimes, too, it could be shown that their ancestors were holding the same lands by the same service early in the twelfth century. Many of them, no doubt, were subordinate to no one but the king; they were, in fact, rather hereditary wardens than foresters in fee, according to the usage of those words which is adopted for convenience in this book; others, however, were undoubtedly foresters in fee, and subordinate to a warden. Perhaps in some cases they were enfeoffed of their bailiwicks by the king, and a warden was afterwards placed above them with the custody of some royal castle in the neighbourhood. The king would grant certain of the rights which he had over the forest, and the rents paid to him by the foresters in fee, to a bailiff or warden to hold at an annual rent. But these are matters on which generalisation is dangerous. Until we have more documents relating to the forests printed and indexed, we can say little of many aspects of the early history of any of the forests; still less can we speak with any confidence of the varying relation which obtained between a warden and a forester[1] in fee.

The Woodwards.

The king's demesnes, it must be remembered, formed but a portion of the lands within his forests. The residue included extensive woods, over which the owners enjoyed most of the ordinary rights of property. In fact, the only limitation upon their rights may be expressed briefly by saying that they could do nothing by which the woods would cease to afford shelter for the beasts of the forest. In precise language, they could not make 'essart[2] purpresture or waste' without the king's licence. Now in order to protect their rights they, like other landowners outside the forest, required the assistance of an official bearing a close resemblance to a royal forester. His principal duty was to attach trespassers in their woods and compel them to make answer for their offences. But these officials were made by the forest laws to serve two masters. They were compelled to protect the king's venison as well as their masters' woods. Every

[1] Like the verderers, the foresters in fee were not liable to be put in juries and assizes. (See *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. pp. 59, 94.)

[2] These words are explained on pp. lxxviii, lxxx and lxxxiii below.

owner of a wood within a forest was obliged to have a forester, which, far from being a hardship, was a convenience; but the forester[1] was bound to swear fealty to the king and his venison, and the vert. If the owner of such a wood had no forester, or if he had a forester who had not taken the necessary oath, the wood was seised into the King's hands. The forester was called a woodward. His lord was bound to present him to the chief justice of the forest, before whom, and none other, he was sworn, and at every eyre of the forest he was bound to present him before the justices in eyre, under pain of his wood being taken into the king's hands.

A woodward, then, was nothing more than a private forester, sworn to protect the king's interests. If a trespass was committed in his wood and was discovered for the first time by the royal forester, the wood was taken into the king's hands. Of this a good example occurred in the Buckinghamshire eyre of 1255, which is enrolled[2] as follows:

Presentatum est per forestarios et uiridarios et conuictum quod in uigilia sancti Edmundi martiris anno etc. tricesimo quinto circa horam nonam duo mastini domini S. de P. scilicet unus fuscus et unus niger inuenti fuerunt in bosco dicti S. apud H. dilacerantes unum brokettum uulneratum in dextera hanchia. Et quia dicta transgressio primo inuenta fuit per forestarium domini regis et non per wudewardum ipsius S., ideo boscus capiatur in manu domini regis.

The Rangers.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, we meet a new officer, who was styled a ranger. His duties were considered by Manwood to relate to the purlieus or districts which were disafforested in the great disafforestment of the year 1301. It is, however, impossible to explain his duties and status, or the laws which prevailed in the forest purlieus, without an investigation of the history of the forests in the fourteenth century, which lies outside the scope of the present work. It is sufficient to remark that the rangers are seldom mentioned[3] in documents of the reign of Edward III.; that they may be

[1] A woodward was not entitled to carry bows and arrows in the forest, but only an axe. The following is a recital in the record of the case mentioned on p. xi above: 'quilibet wodewardus per assisam foreste debeat portare in foresta hachettum et non arcum et sagittas pro sinistra suspiccione uenacionis deponenda ad presentandum tam de uiridi quam de uenacione.' (See Coram Rege Rolls 315, Rot. 106.)

[2] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 2, *Roll* 1.

[3] In some letters patent dated 24 October 1371 Henry Dolyng is described as ranger of the New Forest, and in similar letters of two days later Thomas of Croydon is described as ranger of Waltham (Patent Roll

considered as a particular kind of foresters rather than as a specially created class of officers; and that we meet with them only when the whole system of forest administration was in a state of dissolution.

Regarders.

The duties of the officers known as regarders are discussed on a subsequent page under the general heading 'The Regard.'

The Agisters.

The only remaining forest officers were the agisters, of whom there were usually four in each forest. They were chiefly concerned with the collection of money for the agistment of cattle and pigs in the king's demesne woods and lawns. Beasts of the plough and sheep were allowed to pasture over the lawns and open spaces in the forests, subject to customary restrictions, but they were allowed in none of the forests during the fortnights before and after Midsummer day respectively, a period which was known as the Fence Month or in Latin Mensis Uetitus. They were excluded because the deer were supposed to be fawning during this season. Pigs were agisted in the king's demesne woods from 14 September till about 11 November in every year, and a few pence were paid for each pig agisted, the number varying in different forests. The agisters counted the pigs as they entered the forest, and collected the pence as the pigs came out. The wardens seem to have appointed them, but there is at least one case [1] recorded of an agister being elected in the county court in the same way as a verderer.

287, m. 19). There are probably many earlier instances of the use of the word on the Patent Rolls of Ed. iii. Rangers are not mentioned as officers attending the forest inquisitions of the fourteenth century. In one inquisition held in Braden forest in 12 Ed. iii. a man is described as 'nuper rengiarius eiusdem foreste' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 281, *Roll* 4 *in dorso*); in an inquisition concerning Whittlewood forest, held in 48 Ed. iii., the following passage occurs: 'Item dicunt quod Almaricus de sancto Amando senescallus foreste inter pontes Oxon' et Staunford', qui non de iure habere deberet neque de antiqua consuetudine nisi unum locum tenentem per totam forestam predictam et unum clericum atque unum rangiatorem in qualibet foresta, modo habet plures.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 285, *Roll* 4.) And in another inquisition, held in Brokenhurst in 40 Ed. iii., it was found: 'quod ubi forestarii equites et due rangiatores dicte foreste solebant habere unum hominem in foresta predicta, dicti forestarii nunc habent tres homines ad nocumentum patrie ad leuandum dicta amerciamenta contra assisam foreste.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 310.)

[1] Close Roll 112, m. 12.

III.

THE LESSER COURTS OF THE FOREST.

Manwood's Arrangement and the Swanimote.

When Manwood wrote his treatise on the 'Forest Lawes,' traditions of them may have survived still, although, as a body, they had fallen long since into desuetude. Various rights and privileges of which we in the nineteenth century can learn little may have been enforced in his day, but they could not have contributed much towards the elucidation of the broad outlines of our subject. In the main his knowledge of the forest laws, like ours, was derived from official records, and not from direct experience of their application. For this reason we ought to attach little weight to his assertions where they are deductions only from documents to which we also have access. If the Charter of the Forest had been issued for the first time in the reign of Elizabeth, Manwood's opinion on its construction might have been interesting and even valuable. But issued as it was in the reign of Henry III., we should, if we desire to ascertain its effect, use the methods of construction of the thirteenth century. So, too, we should consider how far the political events and conditions of that time permitted the strict observance of its provisions. And above all we should remember that if we have evidence of the way in which it was observed, its intended construction is interesting to the historian so far only as it throws light upon conditions which prevailed before its issue.

Manwood's account of the forest courts needs revision. After studying the Charter of the Forest he arrived at the conclusion that it provided for certain judicial sessions at particular times. From this he assumed that those sessions were actually held. 'First,' he says,[1] 'it is to be understood that there be three principal and chief courts usually kept for matters of the forest, that is to say, the court of attachments, the court of swanimotes,[2] and the high court[3] of the Lord

[1] *Forest Lawes*, ed. 1615, chapter xxi. p. 187 v°.

[2] The letter *i* in the word swanimote probably represents the syllable *ge* in 'gemote.' Swanimotes are seldom mentioned in documents earlier in date than the Charter of the Forest. One of the earliest instances of its use is in the charter of 6 December 1189 to the monks of Peterborough recorded on the Carte Antique Roll E E. or 37.

[3] The court which Manwood described as the Court of Justice seat was derived from the court of the justices in eyre for pleas of the forest which is described on pp. 1 to lxxv below. The phrase 'justice seat' was not in use in the thirteenth century.

Justice in eyre of the Forest, commonly called the justice seat.' In modern English, when we speak of a court[1] we usually mean a judicial session either for the purpose of deciding some issue in fact or in law, or for the purpose of conducting some preliminary inquiry, such as a coroner's inquest, upon which further judicial proceedings may take place. On the other hand, in the middle ages, or at any rate in the thirteenth century, the Latin word 'curia' which represented the word 'court' was seldom required for this purpose. The county court was called 'comitatus' or the county; the hundred court 'hundredum' or the hundred; and similarly the court which Manwood called the court of attachments was called simply 'attachiamentum' or the attachment. Manwood was probably aware of this usage, so when he read in the Charter of the Forest that 'suanimota' or swanimotes were to be held three times a year only, he thought that the word 'suanimota' meant a court sitting for the administration of some particular branch of the forest law. The words of the Charter were as follows:

> Nullum suanimotum de cetero teneatur in regno nostro nisi ter in anno; uidelicet in principio quindecim dierum ante festum sancti Michaelis, quando agistatores conueniunt ad agistandum dominicos boscos nostros; et circa festum sancti Martini quando agistatores nostri debent recipere pannagium nostrum; et ad ista duo suanimota conueniant forestarii, uiridarii, et agistatores et nullus alius per districcionem; et tercium suanimotum teneatur in inicio quindecim dierum ante festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste, pro feonacione bestiarum nostrarum; et ad istud suanimotum tenendum conueniant forestarii et uiridarii et nulli alii per districcionem. Et preterea singulis quadraginta diebus per totum annum conuenient uiridarii et forestarii ad uidendum attachiamenta de foresta, tam de uiridi, quam de uenacione, per presentacionem ipsorum forestariorum, et coram ipsis attachiatis. Predicta autem suanimota non teneantur nisi in comitatibus in quibus teneri consueuerunt.

It may well be argued that the word 'suanimotum' was intended to apply to a court with some particular jurisdiction; but on the other hand such an interpretation is not necessary. The article is quite

[1] It was used rather with reference to the person entitled to the profits of judicial proceedings than to their subject matter or the persons before whom they were held. Fines were made 'in the court of the lord king' but 'before his justices.' Expressions such as 'the court of the bench' were not in official use in the thirteenth century. The word 'bench' was sufficient to describe the court. On the other hand, in manor courts the word 'curia' was used to describe both the judicial session and also the persons who made presentments, even in the reign of Hen. iii. As to this see *Selden Society Publications*, vol. i. Again, in an ordinance of 11 October 1234 relating to the Sheriff's Tourn the words 'curie magnatum Anglie' occur (see *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 118; *Annales Monastici, Dunstaplia*, Rolls Series, vol. iii. p. 139).

intelligible if we translate 'suanimotum' by the words 'forest assembly,' which do not suggest any particular jurisdiction.

But, not content with asserting that there was a distinct court called the court of swanimote which sat at regular intervals, Manwood went so far as to describe [1] its jurisdiction. He says:

> The court of attachments cannot determine any offence or trespass of the forest, if the value of the same trespass be above the value of four pence, but that the same offence and trespass, if the value be more than four pence must be by the said verderers inrolled in their roll and so to be sent from thence to the swanimote to have an orderly trial of the same there according to the laws of the forest.

On another page [2] he says:

> It is to be understood that the court of swanimote is a court of the forest, which should be holden three times in the year as is aforesaid for to enquire of vert and venison and other trespasses that are done within the forest; and there all the trespasses of the forest shall be enquired of and presented.

These extracts show that he thought that the swanimote was a court held three times a year for the purpose of trying certain offences adjourned from the court of attachments and of inquiring into and receiving presentments of all trespasses and offences against the forest laws. His notion that this court was held three times a year was taken from the Charter; his description of its jurisdiction was derived from other sources which will be discussed presently.

The three days in every year on which Manwood thought that the Charter authorised the holding of a court of swanimote were 'at the beginning of the fifteen days before the feast of St. Michael, when the agisters assemble to agist our demesne woods'; and 'about the feast of St. Martin, when our agisters ought to receive our pannage'; and 'at the beginning of the fifteen days before the feast of St. John the Baptist, for the fawning of our beasts.' If courts of swanimote, having the jurisdiction and powers which Manwood ascribed to them, were to be held three times a year only, the days appointed for them were strangely chosen. Is it to be supposed that offences against the forest laws were committed most frequently at the season of pannage and when the king's deer were fawning? If such a court was required at regular intervals, should we not expect to find one during the winter months, when trespassers would go by night into the woods to take logs for fuel, timber for shelter and

[1] *Forest Lawes*, ed. 1615, chapter xxi. p. 187 v°. [2] p. 225 v° (chapter xxiii.).

venison for sustenance. It is easier to suppose that the swanimotes were authorised to enable the forest officers to superintend the depasturing of pigs in the king's woods in the autumn and the clearance of the forest of cattle and sheep while the deer were fawning in the summer. The subjects of agistment, pannage and fawning would hardly be mentioned after the dates of these assemblies, if these were not the principal subjects for which they were to be held.[1] We shall see presently that the word 'swanimote' was a vague word used both of the attachment courts and the forest inquisitions.

The Attachment Court.

Many rolls[2] of attachment courts still exist at the Record Office which show clearly the nature of their jurisdiction. In general they were held every forty-two days, always on the same day of the week in the several bailiwicks into which a forest might be divided for the purpose. Thus they were held[3] at Linby, Calverton, Mansfield and Edwinstone, in the forest of Sherwood, on Monday, Wednesday, Thursday and Friday respectively in every sixth week; and in most of the other forests of which we have now rolls of attachment courts they seem to have been held at the same intervals. There were, however, exceptions: for instance, in two of the bailiwicks of the forest[4] of Inglewood they were held every twenty-eighth instead of every forty-second day.

The jurisdiction of the court was small. It had no authority to try or even to inquire judicially into cases relating to the venison,[5] and the rolls of the courts may be searched in vain for such a case. This

[1] See also the passage from the Year Book concerning Whaddon chase printed on p. cxiv below.

[2] The earliest is one of attachments held in the forest of Galtres in Yorkshire in 17 Ed. i. The heading of the enrolment of these courts was in the following form: 'Attachiamenta apud Hoby die Sabati proxima ante festum sancti Marci Ewangeliste anno regni regis Edwardi decimo septimo.' Courts were held in this forest every forty-second day. (*For. Proc. Tr. of Rec. No.* 237.)

A roll of attachments held in the forest of Inglewood in 23 Edward i. is at the Public Record Office. The heading of the earliest of these courts is as follows, 'Perquisita de attachiamentis foreste de Engilwude.' The headings of subsequent courts on the same roll are simply 'Perquisita foreste.' At this time the courts were held every forty-second day. (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 2.)

[3] See Accounts, Exchequer, Q. R., Bundle 134, No. 16.

[4] Twelve attachment courts were held in every year in this forest towards the end of the reign of Edward ii. In one bailiwick they were held on Wednesdays and in the other on Thursdays. (Accounts, Exch. Q. R., Bundle 131, No. 22.)

[5] Trespasses against the venison were investigated in inquisitions made by four neighbouring townships before the foresters and verderers. Sometimes, no doubt, these inquisitions were made on the same day as that on which a court of attachments was held. (See p. xlv note 5 below.) But it was the usual practice for the inquisition to be held soon after the offence had been committed.

was not contrary to the provision of the Charter which directed the foresters and verderers to assemble every forty days to view the attachments as well of the vert as of the venison; for that direction may relate to ministerial rather than judicial proceedings. Nor had the court jurisdiction to try cases relating to the vert except where the trespasses were small. The distinction between small and great trespasses was of course definite, and not in the discretion of the forest officers; but it seems certain that it varied in different forests. We know what it was in the forest of Sherwood; for in the fifteenth year of Edward I. Sir William de Vescy and his colleagues, then justices in eyre at Nottingham, finding that the assize of the forest was not being properly observed, issued an ordinance[1] with the object of regulating the jurisdiction of the court of attachments. It provided that the verderers were to assemble every forty days to hold attachments both concerning the vert and the venison, and concerning the holding and pleading of small pleas which ought to be pleaded in attachments, such as those pleas which were touched upon in other provisions of the ordinance. Though the language of the ordinance is ill chosen, its meaning is clear. The ministerial is distinguished from the judicial business, which is explained in some detail as follows. People who lived in the forest and were taken in the king's demesne woods cutting saplings or branches or dry wood from oaks, or hazels, or thorn, or a lime, or an alder, or a holly tree and such like trees, might be amerced in the attachment court unless the sapling were appraised at more than four pence, in which case the offender was to be attached to answer for his trespass at the next eyre. Again, all trespasses in the outlying woods, outside the king's demesne woods, were to be pleaded in the attachments unless they were pleas which belonged to the eyre of the justices. This provision is certainly a little vague, but it would seem that trespasses to the vert in woods within the forest, but belonging to the king's subjects, were to be classified in the same way as trespasses in his demesne woods for the purpose of determining the jurisdiction of the court of attachment. Finally, there is a provision that all escapes of beasts of the plough in the king's demesne enclosures and woods were to be pleaded in the attachments; as were also other trespasses outside the assize of the forest and against the Charter of the Forest.

Now this ordinance ought not to be considered as creating a new law throughout England. It was issued by the justices in eyre

[1] See p. 62 below.

of the forest north of the Trent, for the benefit of the county of Nottingham, and even if they intended it to apply to the other northern counties, they had no power to extend it to the counties south of the Trent. Its terms, too, are inadequate to explain the law in many of the forests. The beech and the maple may have been scarce in the county of Nottingham, but they grew in abundance in many districts, and the ordinance does not tell us whether the trespasser who took them in the forest could be punished in the court of attachments, or could only be attached to answer for his trespass in the court of the eyre. Nevertheless, in its broad outlines it probably declared the law [1] which obtained on both sides of the river Trent, even though it fails to supply us with certain details of some importance.

Attachment court rolls, consisting as they do of constantly recurring entries of a few particular forms, are of little interest. The following extract from an account [2] rendered at the Exchequer in the year 1316 shows the nature of the proceedings enrolled upon them:

Attachiamentum [3] tentum apud Caluerton die [4] Mercurii in crastino sancti Andree apostoli anno supradicto [10 Ed. II.]:

De I. le W. de C. pro uno blestrone [5]	iijd.
De R. W. de L. pro una caretta branchiarum . .	ijd.
De I. C. de G. quia non habuit W. B.	ijd.
De I. f. S. de G. pro eodem	ijd.
De H. de L. pro uno quercu	vjd.
De R. f. I. B. quia non habuit I. f. S.	ijd.
De R. de C. de N. pro uno bletrone	vjd.
De R. G. de E. pro una caretta branchiarum . .	iijd.
Summa istius attachiamenti . . .	ijs. ijd.

The following extracts from the accounts of other attachment courts held in Sherwood forest in the same year are among the few entries which are of a different nature from those occurring in the account of the court printed above.

[1] The mode of distinguishing small and large trespasses to the vert prescribed by the ordinance does not appear to have obtained in the forests south of the Trent. See p. xxxvi below.

[2] Accounts, Exch. Q. R., Bundle 134, No. 16.

[3] It must be observed that the extract here printed is an account of amercements made at an attachment court and not the record of the proceedings of the court, which would be longer and fuller. The account, however, is sufficient to illustrate the subject matter of the cases heard in attachment courts.

[4] 1 December 1316.

[5] For the meaning of this word see 'Blettro' in the Glossary to this volume.

De R. L. de M. pro uno stubbe	xviijd.
De R. Q. de W. pro truncacione unius stubbe . .	vjd.
De R. D. de K. pro uno stubbe sicco	iiijd.
De W. K. de E. pro escapio bidencium . . .	ijd.
De H. de B. pro truncacione unius blestronis . .	vjd.

There can be little doubt that in some forests, if the procedure was regular, certain ministerial work was performed at the time when the attachments were held. By the ordinance[1] promulgated by Sir William de Vescy in January $128\frac{6}{7}$ it was provided that when anyone dwelling within the forest was found felling an oak, he was to be attached to come to the next attachment, and there he was to find pledges till the next eyre. If those pledges failed to produce him, we may assume that they would be amerced and he would be again attached by pledges. If on the other hand he was unable to find pledges in the original instance, we may assume that the forester would attach him by his goods and chattels instead of by pledges. In these cases we can only assume what happened, because the rolls of attachments give us no information about the procedure which regulated them; but there is no reason to suppose that the process to compel appearance in a forest court differed from that which was used in cases of trespasses in ordinary manor courts.

When the trespasser appeared in the attachment, he found pledges whose names were thereupon enrolled; but the enrolment must have been made upon a special roll, as upon the rolls of attachments which still exist we find no entries relating to the pledges for the appearance of a trespasser at the next eyre.

The object of the finding of pledges on two occasions is not difficult to understand. The pledges whom the forester considered to be sufficient to ensure the appearance of the trespasser at the next attachment might be quite insufficient to ensure his appearance at the next eyre, which might not be held for several years. Obviously the decision as to who were to be accepted as pledges for the production of an offender at the forest eyre was a serious matter, requiring the presence of all the parties interested and the consideration of more than a single forest officer.

Where the trespasser was not an inhabitant of the forest, the forester, instead of attaching him, was bound to send him to a prison from which he could only be released by order of the king or the justice of the forest. This, according to the ordinance of Sir William de Vescy, was the procedure in all cases of trespasses in the king's

[1] See p. 62 below.

demesnes by people who were not inhabitants of the forest, and not merely in those cases where they were found felling oaks. The reason of the greater severity was, no doubt, partly because a trespasser who was not an inhabitant could have no customary rights to bring him into the king's demesne for a lawful purpose, and partly because his offence would usually be harder for the forester to detect; but it was more especially because the foresters had no power to attach any person outside the forest.

There was another ministerial duty which was performed in the attachments held in the forest of Sherwood, the delivery of the price of wood wrongfully cut in the king's demesnes and of animals forfeited for being in the forest in forbidden places or at forbidden times. It seems to be certain that in this matter Sir William de Vescy merely regulated the existing practice by his ordinance; for the entries of pleas of the vert held at the first eyre in Nottingham after he issued it differ only in form [1] from the enrolment of the pleas of the vert in other forests North of the Trent at an earlier date. They differ, however, both in form and substance from the entries of pleas of the vert held in the forests South of the Trent, of an earlier as well as of a later date. After this ordinance an account was rendered at the Exchequer at irregular intervals of the amercements which had been made in the forest of Sherwood since the last account of a similar kind was rendered. With such amercements, being for the small trespasses to the vert specified in the ordinance, the justices in eyre had no concern. The amercements of all other offences to the vert were made by the justices and entered on the eyre rolls. But from the next eyre after the ordinance, after each entry [2] we find the words 'wherewith the verderers are charged in their roll of the price of the vert' or others to the same effect. At the head of another of the rolls [3] of the same eyre, we have the words 'of the price of the vert,' and beneath it an account of the price of the vert year by year from the time of the last eyre.

Now this was not the ordinary procedure south of the Trent. We do not read of accounts being rendered at the Exchequer of amercements by the attachment courts. The king and his advisers may have claimed them, and sometimes [4] successfully, but on the other hand the wardens and foresters in fee no doubt sometimes made a suc-

[1] Thus at the Cumberland eyre of November 1285 the verderers accounted for the price of oaks unlawfully taken; but sometimes they accounted for the price of oaks appraised at less than four pence. (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 5.)

[2] See pp. 67, 68 below.

[3] See p. 68 below.

[4] An account of the profits of the courts of attachment held during the years 30 to

cessful resistance.[1] Peter de Neville, for instance, the warden of Rutland, seems to have appropriated to himself, among many other things, pleas of thorns, hazels and such like small vert, which would be pleaded in attachment courts. The justices in eyre, it is true, in 1269 ordered him to answer for the profits of his misappropriations, but the eyre rolls do not tell us whether the order was obeyed or not, and one of his successors in title undoubtedly died seised of nearly all, if not all, that he claimed.[2]

Again, we may search in vain among the eyre rolls of the reign of Henry III. for proof [3] that the verderers accounted in the eyre for wood which had been unlawfully cut in the forests south of the Trent. It may be that in strict law they were bound to account for it; but the absence of any evidence that they did so renders it probable that the law was not strictly observed in this respect.[4]

We have seen that the finding pledges for offences against the vert in the forest of Sherwood, and probably elsewhere, took place in the attachment court. But the Charter of the Forest speaks of attachments as well of the vert as of the venison, and we should therefore expect to find poachers attached there in just the same way as trespassers to the vert. It is, however, probable that in many forests pledges for the appearance of poachers at the eyre were not found in the attachment courts, and that the direction in the Charter was not strictly observed in this respect. It was considered sufficient for the offender to be attached in the presence of the foresters and verderers in the manner which we shall describe presently.[5]

To summarise; the court of attachments was a court which,

41 Hen. iii. in some of the forests of Wiltshire was rendered at the eyre of 1257 by John earl of Warwick. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 198, *Roll* 7.) The profits of the courts were described as 'small pleas.' The following is the account rendered for 30 Hen. iii.:

'De Iohanne comite Warewyk' de herbagio de Cippham, anno tricesimo	xij sol.
'De eodem de melle uendito anno eodem .	ij sol. vj. den.
'De eodem de cablecio anno eodem	vij sol.
'De eodem de minutis placitis et de escapiis anno eodem	viij sol.'

[1] See p. 47, below.

[2] Peter de Neville forfeited the bailiwick of the forest of Rutland for his misconduct (see note 3, p. xvii, above); but it was granted back to his son Theobald by letters patent dated 13 September 1300. But although he appears to have received no privileges from the king which had not been enjoyed by his father Peter, his descendant Anne Chiselden was found by inquisition dated 23 March 144$\frac{4}{5}$ to have died seised of the custody of the forest of Rutland 'cum wyndfallyn wode dere fallyn wode cabliciis wodsylver heggyngsylver, attachiamentis forestariorum, extractibus swanimottorum proficuis eorum et chiminagio ac faciendi et amouendi omnes forestarios eiusdem foreste ad uoluntatem suam.' (Inq. post mortem, 23 Hen. vi. No. 14.)

[3] In a few cases it may be found that the verderers accounted at the eyre for wood which had been unlawfully cut, but such cases are quite exceptional.

[4] The explanation may be that the amercement at the eyre was considered to include the price of the wood.

[5] See p. xxxix below.

sitting at regular intervals, usually every sixth week, was chiefly concerned in trying cases of small trespasses to the vert. The distinction between small trespasses and large trespasses varied in different forests,[1] and it is impossible, at present, to lay down any general rules on the subject. Persons who were accused of trespasses to the vert which were too large for it to try were attached in it to appear before the justices in eyre of the forest. In the matter of venison it had no judicial functions at all, and pledges were not found in it by trespassers for their appearance before the justices in eyre as was the case in trespasses to the vert. In the forest of Sherwood, and probably in the other forests north of the Trent, the price of beasts forfeited for being in the forest in forbidden places or at forbidden times, and also the price of wood felled or carried away by trespassers were paid to the verderers in the court of attachments, for them to keep until the next forest eyre. No doubt, too, other small ministerial duties, varying in the different forests, were performed in the same court.

Before leaving the subject it should be noticed that in some forests the courts of attachments were called swanimotes. There is[2] a roll of attachment courts held in the forest of Cliffe in the early years of the reign of Edward III. in which the proceedings of each court are styled 'Swanimotum tentum apud Cliue die Mercurii etc.' There can be no doubt that these courts were attachments. They were held every forty-second day, and they were concerned with the same matters as were the attachment courts which were held in the forest of Sherwood. Nor should we suppose that this was an isolated practice. We have seen[3] that Peter de Neville appropriated to himself pleas of thorns, hazels and such like small vert in the forest of Rutland, pleas which would certainly be held in the attachment courts in any other county. But the entry from which we learn of this

[1] In the forest of Bernwood in Buckinghamshire attachments of small thorns belonged to the chief forester and those of large ones to the king. It was found by an inquisition held in 1266 that small thorns in this forest were those which could not be pierced by an auger called a 'restauger' (see p. 122 below). On another occasion certain jurors gave the following answer to the question how the division was made between thorns belonging to the king and the forester:

'Dicunt quod omnes forestarii qui faciunt attachiamenta in foresta iurati sunt domino regi de fidelitate et cum uenerint coram senescallo ad swanimotum et ibi presentent attachiamenta senescallus interrogat eis per sacramentum domino regi factum utrum spine fuerint pertinentes ad dominum regem uel ad forestarium, et cum dicunt ad regem, tunc senescallus placitat illud placitum ad opus domini regis; et si dicunt quod ad forestarium, tunc idem forestarius placitat illud placitum ad opus suum.' (*Rotuli Hundredorum*, i. 26.)

The steward here mentioned was the warden of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford, and the forester was the forester in fee of the forest of Bernwood (see p. xvii above).

[2] *For Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 96.

[3] See p. 47 below.

appropriation continues with the words 'and pleaded them in his swanimotes.' Remembering that the forest of Rutland was on the one side of the river Welland and the forest of Cliffe on the other, we may conclude from the words we have quoted that the attachment courts were called swanimotes in the former forest as well as in the latter.[1] The word 'attachment' apparently was not the recognised designation of the court in all parts of the country. At an inquisition [2] held in the forest of Essex in the year 1239, a man was put by gage and pledge to be at the next forest hundred because he was not present at the inquisition. Now the hundred was a civil court, which was held every third week in each of the territorial divisions of a county called hundreds, and had a small jurisdiction in civil matters. It would seem, then, that the forest hundred was the term used to describe the court of attachments in the county of Essex at this time, as a court analogous in functions to the civil hundred.

The Special Inquisition.[3]

Although the courts of attachments were only concerned with the small cases of trespasses to the vert and had no judicial power in cases of trespasses to the venison, there was no other forest court which sat at regular intervals, and none which had any final jurisdiction in the intervals between the sessions of the justices in eyre. But it must not be supposed that the attachment courts and the court of the justices in eyre were the only tribunals which administered or assisted in administering the forest laws. The forest inquisitions—of which there were two sorts, the special and the general—formed the basis of proceedings for trespasses to the venison.

By the articles known as the 'Consuetudines et Assise Foreste,' which are included among the 'Statuta Incerti Temporis' of the 'Statutes of the Realm,' [4] it was provided that if any beast of the forest

[1] It appears from the following extract from the Gloucester eyre rolls of 10 Ed. i. that the attachment courts in the forest of Dean were sometimes called swanimotes :

'Et quia placita de uiridi in swanimotis foreste hactenus in debito modo placitata sunt et presentata preceptum est constabulario et forestariis et uiridariis quod de cetero attachiamenta de uiridi racionabiliter fiant et placitentur et de quolibet attachiato duo salui plegii capiantur et irrotulentur, et quod quilibet forestarius de feodo habeat erga se rotulum de omnibus attachiamentis de uiridi et de uenacione, presentandum coram iusticiariis et eciam de aliis que balliuas suas contingunt.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 30, *Roll* 33.)

[2] See p. 70 below.

[3] It must be understood that the phrase 'special inquisition' was not in use at the time when the forest laws were enforced. It has been adopted in this book as a convenient one for describing the forest inquisition of the reign of Henry iii. It afterwards gave place to the 'general inquisition' which is described on a subsequent page.

[4] Vol. i. p. 243. According to Manwood

were found dead or wounded an inquisition was to be held by four neighbouring townships of the forest; the finder of the deer was to be put by six pledges, the flesh was to be sent to a neighbouring spittal house or given to the sick and poor; the head and the skin were to be given to the freemen of the neighbouring township, and the arrow was to be presented to a verderer. The word which represents beast of the forest in the original is 'fera,' which is usually translated by the word 'deer.' As, however, inquisitions [1] were held on dead or wounded wild boars and on hares in those districts where they were preserved by the forest laws, we may reasonably render 'fera' by beast of the forest in this passage.

It is very doubtful when these articles were first issued, but our earliest record [2] of an inquisition which seems to have been made pursuant to them is of the year 1238.[3] In another inquisition made two years later we read of a buck which was found one Sunday lying dead in a field in the forest of Essex. On the same day an inquisition was held by four neighbouring townships, who said that it died of murrain and was almost dragged to pieces by the pigs. Each of the townships found pledges of being before the justices in eyre at their next pleas, as also did the four neighbours, the finder of the buck and the lady in whose field it was found. The head with its antlers was entrusted to a man—presumably a freeman of one of the neighbouring townships—to produce before the justices, while the mutilated flesh and the skin were, no doubt, left for the pigs to devour. Here we have some observances which were not directed by the 'Consuetudines et Assise'—namely, the finding pledges by the four townships, the four neighbours and the owner of the field respectively. Probably the procedure was adopted which obtained in inquisitions before the coroners [4] on the bodies of dead men, it being usual for the four neighbours, and all suspected persons, as well as the four townships which

(*Forest Lawes*, ed. 1615, p. 8) they were issued in 6 Edward i., but he gives no authority for his statement. No official version of them is to be found on the rolls at the Public Record Office, but there are many copies of them in private collections of statutes at the British Museum and elsewhere. It is possible that the articles are not all of the same date. The directions as to attachments for trespasses to the vert are of a detailed character, and they do not appear to have been strictly observed in the latter part of the reign of Henry iii. On the other hand, the inquisitions of 22 to 26 Henry iii. printed on pp. 69 to 74 below, show a stricter compliance with the articles relating to the venison than those of 32 to 39 Henry iii. printed on pp. 74 to 116 below. It is probable that the first eleven articles were issued in the early years of the reign of Henry iii. or even in the reign of John. The eyre rolls certainly show no change in the forest law or its administration after 6 Edward i. which in any way corroborates Manwood's statement that they were issued in that year.

[1] See p. xii, note 2, above.

[2] See p. 69 below. [3] See p. 71 below.

[4] As to this see the Introduction to vol. ix. of the *Publications of the Selden Society*.

made the inquisition, to find pledges to come before the justices in eyre. The owner of the field was, no doubt, considered a suspected person. Subsequent inquisitions, however, show that the four neighbours usually found no pledges, although it frequently happened [1] that the four townships and the finder of the beast and persons under suspicion did so.

Numerous examples [2] show that when an arrow was found in a dead or wounded beast of the forest, it was delivered to the verderer. But the verderer, instead of being allowed to retain it for his own use as the words of the 'Consuetudines et Assise' suggest, was bound to keep it for production before the justices at the next forest eyre. The justices probably received them, together with any antlers [3] and skins which might be produced at the eyre, for the use of the king and not as perquisites for themselves. Being articles of small value, they were not sent to the king one by one, but were collected instead by the justices in eyre.

Inquisitions by the four neighbouring townships were also held when trespasses had been committed in the forest. Persons whom the townships found to have been guilty of offences against the venison, were either sent to prison [4] or attached there and then to appear before the justices in eyre according to the gravity of the trespass. The bows, arrows and snares [5] which were found upon a trespasser were delivered to a verderer for him to produce before the justices just as were arrows found in wounded beasts. On the other hand, if greyhounds were found in the forest belonging to poachers or straying in pursuit of venison, they were sent [6] forthwith to the justice of the forest and not detained for production before the justices in eyre; but it is probable that the justice handed them over to the king, as soon as he received them.

The ordinary ministerial work of attaching trespassers against the venison to appear at the next forest eyre seems to have been done in the special inquisition, and not in the court of attachments. If we look at the records of special inquisitions, we find repeated instances of persons being attached to appear at the next forest eyre, and the statement of the attachment always forms part of the record

[1] See pp. 80, 81, 85, 87, 89 below.

[2] See p. 87 below.

[3] See pp. 83, 87, 90 below.

[4] The trespasser was imprisoned only to secure his appearance at the forest eyre. It was usual for him to be released to pledges until the coming of the justices in eyre.

[5] See pp. 84, 85, 95 below.

[6] See p. 81. In one case they were sent to John Mansel, the warden of the forest in which they were taken (see p. 13 below). It should be remembered that John Mansel was a member of the king's council and was constantly with him.

of the inquisition. There is nothing to suggest that the attachment was made on any other occasion, or at the court of attachments in particular. The Charter of the Forest certainly directed the verderers and foresters to assemble every forty days to view the attachments not only with respect to the vert, but also with respect to the venison. But the spirit of the provision was in no way violated by the attachments of trespassers to the venison being made in the forest inquisitions. The purpose of the charter was, no doubt, to secure publicity, but this was quite sufficiently assured by an attachment at an inquisition, which was made before the foresters and verderers by four neighbouring townships.

The forest inquisition was necessary only when a beast of the forest was found dead or wounded, or when a trespass had been committed in the forest. If a man was caught in the act of taking venison he was forthwith imprisoned and could only be set at liberty by a writ from the king or the justice of the forest. According to the Charter of the Forest, if a man was arrested and convicted of taking venison he was to be heavily ransomed, if he had wherewith he could be ransomed, and if he had not wherewith he could be ransomed he was to lie in prison for a year and a day, and if after a year and a day he could find pledges he was to come out of prison, and if he could not find them he was to abjure the realm.[1] Thus the longest term of imprisonment was to be a year and a day. But in the middle of the reign of Henry III., and perhaps at the beginning of his reign, when a man who had taken venison was arrested and sent to prison, he was imprisoned in the first instance by way of process and not by way of punishment. He was usually released by writ[2] to twelve persons, who undertook to produce him at the next eyre and that he would commit no trespass in the meantime. His punishment was always reserved for the justices in eyre, and to this rule there were no exceptions. It is difficult to say how long men might lie in prison before they were released on pledge. Certainly they sometimes lay there more than a year and a day, but these were exceptional

[1] The article of the Charter which provides these penalties is printed on p. lxv below.

[2] The writ by which the king directed delivery was in the following form:

'Le rey salue tel vis*conte*. Nus v*us* maundo*ns* k*e* si vn tel p*ris* e enp*ris*one a tel lyu p*ur* trespas de veneson in tele forest ou en tel park eyt troue xij bons e sauues plegg*es* k*e* le eyent p*ris* en bail a au*er* le deua*n*t iustic*es* p*ro*cheyn erranz a lez plez de la forest en tel conte a respondre de le aua*n*t-dit trespas e k*e* desoremes ne mesfra de n*ost*re veneson, dunk*es* le facez deliu*er*er de la p*ris*on en la quele il est detenu k*e* cez plegg*es* de luy respoyne*n*t sicu*m* est dit. E eyez lez nons dez plegg*es* e ceo br*ef*.' (Add. MS. 32085 at British Museum, fo. 142 r°.)

cases of which the justices took note, in considering the punishment[1] in the eyre.

The practice as to enrolling special inquisitions probably varied in different forests, and as we have but few records of them it is impossible to speak with any confidence on the subject. The rolls on which they are recorded and which still survive contain besides the inquisitions other memoranda relating to the venison. When a man was taken in the act of unlawfully killing venison, the story of the trespass is duly enrolled. When an archbishop, bishop, earl or baron passed through the forest, he was entitled[2] under the Charter of the Forest to take one or two beasts. On the rolls[3] of the special inquisitions in the forest of Rockingham for the years 30 to 39 Hen. III. all the cases in which venison was taken in exercise of this right are recorded under the headings 'Venison taken without warrant.' In like manner the king's presents of venison are recorded under the heading 'Venison given by the king's writ.'

There is some ground for thinking that the verderers had one roll of special inquisitions in a particular forest; and that the foresters had another.[4] A roll,[5] or portion of a roll, relating to the venison in the forest of Huntingdon during the years 1248 to 1252, which is still in a good state of preservation, is printed in this volume. A portion of a second roll,[6] which is in a very bad state of preservation, contains

[1] The following entry occurs on the Buckinghamshire eyre roll of 1256:

'Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum quod . . . . una dama inuenta fuit in domo W. A. et I. fratris eius de F. quam damam cognouerunt se cepisse cum quadam machina ferrea. Qui W. et I. capti et missi fuerunt ad prisonam apud E. qui ibi iacuerunt usque nunc. Et modo ueniunt, et quia non habent unde redimi possint nec plegios inuenire possunt etc., ideo remaneant in prisona per unum annum et unum diem; et postea si invenire possunt plegios etc., sin autem abiurent regnum etc. Postea quia pauperes et per prisonam in qua iacuerunt per unum annum et dimidium et amplius ualde debilitati sunt corporibus suis condonatur pro rege transgressio sua predicta.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 2, *Roll* 2.) See also p. lxvi below.

[2] The article in the Charter of the Forest of 6 November 1217 is as follows:

'Quicunque archiepiscopus, episcopus, comes, uel baro transierit per forestam nostram liceat ei capere unam uel duas bestias per uisum forestarii si presens fuerit, sin autem faciat cornari ne uideatur furtiue hoc facere.'

In the charter of 11 February 122$\frac{4}{5}$ this article was amended by the addition after the word 'baro' of the words 'ueniens ad nos ad mandatum nostrum;' and by the addition of the words, 'Idem liceat eis in redeundo facere sicut predictum est.'

[3] See pp. 79 to 116 below.

[4] The roll of the foresters, if they had one, would probably be kept by the warden of the forest.

[5] See pp. 74 to 79 below.

[6] The following extract from this roll should be compared with a corresponding entry on the roll printed on p. 75 of this volume:

'[Contigit die] dominica in ramis Palmarum quod cum forestarii domini regis de Wauberge et forestarii de Sappele [fecissent u]igiliam sub haya de Sappel' perceperunt in crepusculo noctis malefactores cum leporariis . . . . . sub haya predicta, et cum malefactores percepissent forestarios in fugam conuersi sunt, set predicti [forestarii] ceperunt vnum de malefactoribus, qui uocabatur Radulfus de Fentone; quem cum forestarii cepissent [interrog]auerunt eum quis esset et cum quo et eorum nomina qui cum eo fuerunt. Et cognouit quod ipse uocabatur Radulfus de Fentone; et alius qui cum eo erat

the same subject matter. But a comparison of the two documents shows that neither of them is a copy of the other. Again, in the roll[1] of the Rutland eyre of 1256, the following passage occurs:

Et quia uiridarii predicti non faciunt aliquam mencionem in rotulo suo de correo predicte dame et in rotulo forestariorum inde sit mencio et dictum correum modo presentatum est; ideo in misericordia.

It may be that these are exceptional cases; but we find in the forest of Rockingham that the two rolls[2] of inquisitions held during the years 1246 to 1250 and 1250 to 1255 respectively which happen to have survived differed in form from one another, and that one is more faithfully followed in the rolls of the eyre than the other; we may therefore reasonably suppose that in the forest of Rockingham[3] as well as in that of Huntingdon there was more than one set of rolls of the venison for the same period.

The General Inquisition.

We may observe the special inquisition as part of the forest procedure elsewhere than in the few surviving rolls which record examples of it. On the eyre rolls of the reign of Hen. III. we frequently meet with a passage[4] in these or similar words:

An inquisition was held by four neighbouring townships, to wit . . . . ; and because the said townships did not come fully, therefore they are in mercy.

uocabatur Osebertus Marescallus [et terci]us Geruasius cocus et fuerunt cum domino Ieremia de Kaxton'; et venerunt ibi causa uenacionis querende. Et super hec facta fuit inquisicio sub Sappele die Martis proxima post . . . Pasche anno rengni regis Henrici filii regis Iohannis tricesimo tercio coram viridariis et forestariis patrie per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Magnam Stiuecle et Paruam Stiuecle, Reptona Regis, [Repton]a Abbatis et per Herefordiam.

'[Magna] Stiuecle uenit et, iurata, dicit quod Radulfus de Fentone, Osebertus Marescallus [et Geruasius] cocus homines domini Ieremie de Kaxton' venerunt die Dominica in ramis palmarum in [crepusculo] noctis cum leporariis sub Sappele causa uenacionis querende et ad malefaciendum [de uenacione] domini regis et neminem alium habent suspectum nisi predictos malefactores; et hos habent malefactores per [indiccionem] Radulfi de Fentone prenominati.

'[Magna et Parua S]tiuecle veniunt et, iurate, dicunt idem.

'[Reptona R]egis venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

'[Reptona] Abbatis venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

'[Hereford] venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

'[Radulfus de] Fentone, qui captus fuit missus fuit apud Huntedon' ad inprisonandum et liberatus domino Philippo [de Stanto]n', tunc vicecomiti Huntedon'. Et prenominati Osebertus et Geruasius huc usque non fuerunt [attachiati].' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 39.)

[1] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 139, *Roll.* 3.

[2] See pp. 79 to 116 below.

[3] The verderers' rolls are expressly mentioned on p. 27 below.

[4] Examples of this passage occur on pp. 31, 35, 41 and 42 below.

Now in the records[1] of the special inquisitions which still survive we find nothing about the townships not coming fully. There can be little doubt, however, that the question whether a township came fully or not was never debated in the inquisition or at the eyre or anywhere else. There are a few cases[2] in the eyre rolls of a township being amerced for not having come at all to the inquisition, and if the corresponding records[3] of those inquisitions be examined, it will be found that the failure to come at all is expressly mentioned in them. Yet, as we have already observed, when the townships are stated not to have come fully there is no corresponding statement in the record of the inquisition. The explanation is that the not coming fully was in certain events a presumption in law, which required no proof, while the not coming at all was always a fact, which, if the township was to be amerced for its default in the eyre, had to be found by the inquisition. The presumption arose when the townships could ascertain nothing about the matter for which they were assembled, or not sufficient about it to satisfy the justices.

Although the passage which records the amercement was usually in the form described above, we occasionally meet with other forms, which seem to explain the reason of the amercement. Thus in the Huntingdon eyre rolls of 39 Henry III., we usually have:

> And an inquisition was held by four neighbouring townships, to wit . . . . , who could ascertain nothing thereof, and because the townships did not come fully, therefore they are in mercy.[4]

As the inquisitions by the townships are never mentioned on the eyre rolls except when they are amerced for not coming fully, and as the finding that they could ascertain nothing is the only one which is ever mentioned in connection with the not coming fully, we might assume that the statement of the not coming fully depended on the failure to ascertain anything, even if we had no other proof that it did so. It is significant too, that we never find that some only of the four townships are amerced for not having come fully. Either[5] all of them are amerced or none of them.

[1] Records of special inquisitions of the reign of Henry iii. are printed on pp. 69 to 116 below. In only one inquisition, namely that of the 22 August 1255, is there a statement that the townships came fully, and it will be observed that this inquisition was held after the justices in eyre had begun their session. It was probably an experiment on the part of the townships.

[2] See examples on pp. 31 and 36 below.

[3] See pp. 87 and 111 below.

[4] Examples of this or similar expressions will be found on pp. 13, 15, 18, 19, 21, 23, 28, 29 below. In the case at the top of p. 22 it is not stated that the townships had ascertained nothing; but the enrolment shows that they failed to ascertain the name of one of the trespassers. The name was supplied to the justices in eyre by the verderers.

[5] No instance occurs in this volume of

If we examine the rolls of the eyres which were held about 40 Henry III., we find that the amercement of the townships for not coming fully was a common event in all the forests. We find it in entry after entry and we may therefore assume that the special inquisition was part of the forest procedure everywhere. If, however, we examine the rolls of the eyres which were held about fourteen years later, we find that the townships were amerced less often for not coming fully, and except in the early years of his reign they were seldom amerced for this default during the reign of Edward I. Now it is very improbable that the townships throughout England during the reign of Edward I. became so careful that they always ascertained facts in their inquisitions which were sufficient to satisfy the justices in eyre, and it is even more improbable that the justices gradually became more lenient to the townships and thus deprived the king of a source of revenue. It is much more probable that owing to some alteration in the forest procedure the special inquisition gradually ceased to be held. We shall see presently that this was actually the case.[1]

The features of the special inquisition were, first, its purpose, which was that of inquiring into some particular trespass or event relating to the venison; next its date, which was always soon after such trespass had been committed or such event had happened; and lastly the persons by and before whom it was held—namely, by the four neighbouring townships and before the foresters and verderers of the forest. Now there exists a roll of inquisitions which were held

one of four townships being amerced for not coming fully to an inquisition, without the other three townships being also amerced for the same reason. The editor of this volume is not aware of any such instance in other unprinted forest eyre rolls.

[1] The legislation concerning the amercements imposed by justices in eyre for pleas of the crown upon townships which did not come fully to make inquisitions before the sheriffs or coroners is of some interest in relation to the history of the forest inquisitions. By article 24 of the Provisions of Westminster of the year 1259 it was provided as follows:

'Iusticiarii itinerantes de cetero non amerciant uillatas in itinere suo, pro eo quod singuli duodecim annorum non uenerint coram uicecomitibus et coronatoribus ad inquisiciones de morte hominis aut aliis ad coronam pertinentibus, dum tamen de uillis illis ueniant sufficienter per quos inquisitiones huiusmodi plene fieri possint.'

See *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 11.

Article 24 of the Provisions of Marlborough of 1267 was in the following words:

'Iusticiarii itinerantes non amercient de cetero uillatas in itinere suo, pro eo quod singuli duodecim annorum non uenerint coram uicecomitibus et coronatore ad inquisiciones de robberiis et incendiis aut aliis ad coronam spectantibus faciendas, dum tamen de uillis illis ueniant sufficienter per quos huiusmodi inquisiciones plene fieri possint, exceptis inquisicionibus de morte hominis faciendis, ubi omnes duodecim annorum uenire debent nisi racionabilem causam absencie sue habeant.'

See *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 25. In the text printed in the Appendix to *de Antiquis Legibus* (Works of the Camden Society, vol. 34, p. 233) the words 'uiginti unius' occur in place of 'duodecim.'

in the forest of Rockingham in the years 19 to 24 Edward I.,[1] upon which the lost rolls of the next forest eyre were, no doubt based, but the inquisitions have none of the features of the special inquisition. They were not held for the purpose of inquiring into any particular trespass or events. On the contrary, they were concerned with any trespasses which might have been recently committed, trespasses against the vert as well as trespasses against the venison. They were held, too, at such irregular intervals and in so many different places that it would be impossible to arrive at any general rule as to when and where they were held. One[2] was held at Brigstock on the 6th September 1292 before the deputy justice of the forest south of the Trent by the deputy warden or steward of the forest between the bridges of Oxford and Stamford, two riding foresters, three verderers and twelve as well knights as free and loyal men of the neighbouring parts of the forest. Another[3] was held at Geddington on the 2nd January 129$\frac{2}{3}$ before two deputy justices of the forest south of the Trent by the verderers,[4] foresters, regarders, woodwards and neighbouring townships. Usually, however, the inquisition was held before the justice of the forest or his deputy by the foresters, verderers and twelve jurors.

These inquisitions, which gradually took the place of the special inquisitions of the reign of Henry III., may be conveniently called general inquisitions, but they sometimes received the name of swanimotes. Many of the general inquisitions[5] which were held in the forest of Whittlewood during the years 22 to 31 Edward I. are described[6] as having been held 'in pleno swanimotto.' In the year 1306 the new designation 'swanimote' obtained a statutory sanction. In the statute[7] of that year known as 'Ordinatio Forestae,' the general inquisition is called the swanimote and the mode of holding it is

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 82.

[2] Ibid. m. 2.

[3] Ibid. 4.

[4] In this inquisition the names of the individual officers are not recorded.

[5] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 83. The roll contains both general and special inquisitions held at irregular intervals. It should not be assumed that the special inquisition fell into disuse in some forests as soon as it did in others. The procedure in the middle of the reign of Edward i. seems to have varied considerably in different forests. Thus in the forest of Cliffe from 16 to 34 Edward i. it was quite usual for a special inquisition to be held, if there was need for one, at the court of attachments, but general inquisitions were also held from time to time (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, No. 79). In the forest of Salcey both special and general inquisitions were held at intervals from 15 to 33 Edward i. (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 78). The three rolls mentioned in this note are of considerable length, and supply useful material for the history of the lesser courts of the forest in the reign of Edward i. Few records of inquisitions, held at this period, in other forests still exist.

[6] It will be remembered that in the neighbouring forests of Cliffe and Rutland the courts of attachment were called 'swanimotes' (see p. xxxvii above).

[7] *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 148.

declared in detail. The following is a translation of the first chapter of the statute:

First we will and ordain for us and our heirs that with respect to all trespasses hereafter committed in our forests, against our vert and venison, the foresters within whose bailiwicks such trespasses may chance to be committed, do present the same at the next swanimotes before the foresters, verderers, regarders, agisters and other ministers of the same forests, and upon such presentments there, before the foresters, verderers and all other ministers aforesaid, by the oath as well of the knights as of other good and loyal men of the neighbouring parts where the trespasses so presented shall have been committed, not being under suspicion, let the truth be fully inquired, and when the truth has been so inquired let those presentments be solemnly confirmed by the common accord and consent of all the ministers aforesaid and let them be sealed with their seals. And if an indictment be made in any other way, let it be held entirely void.[1]

After the date of this statute general inquisitions were held at frequent intervals in all the forests. The justice of the forest or his lieutenant was invariably present, and the inquisitions were made before him by the forest officers and a body of jurors. An inquisition[2] was made at Guildford on the 9th May 1363 concerning the state of the forest of Windsor by the warden, four foresters, five verderers, twelve regarders and twenty-four free tenants within the metes of the forest. Another inquisition,[3] held at Wokingham on the 11th July 1372, was made by the warden, eight or nine foresters, three verderers, twelve regarders, two agisters, eighteen free tenants within the metes of the forest and twelve free tenants without the metes. But a third inquisition,[4] held at Windsor on the 21st April 1366, was made by the warden, three foresters, four verderers, twelve regarders and twelve free tenants, and also twelve more free tenants within and twelve free tenants without the forest. In inquisitions held in other forests about this time similar variations occur.

The general inquisitions, although sometimes called swanimotes, were not held at the dates on which swanimotes were authorised to be held by the Forest Charter. They were probably held at such times as were convenient to the justice of the forest or his deputy. A considerable number of records of such inquisitions held during the last fifteen years of the reign of Edward III. still exist. Many of them, however, have been lost, and it is therefore difficult to say with any precision at what intervals the inquisitions were held. But some

[1] The name swanimote is applied to these courts in other chapters of the statute.
[2] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 286.
[3] Ibid. *No.* 271, 290.
[4] Ibid. *No.* 317.

information on this point may be derived from the records[1] of the forest of Windsor, which was situate partly in Surrey and partly in Berkshire. It seems to have been usual for the justice to hold two inquisitions on the same day, one concerning the Surrey portion of the forest, the other concerning the Windsor portion. The first column of the following table consists of the dates of all the recorded inquisitions between the years 1363 and 1375; the second, of the places at which they were held; and the third, of the numbers by which the records of them are now cited.

BERKSHIRE

DATE	PLACE	RECORD[2]
9 May 1363	Guildford	No. 286
3 January 136$\frac{3}{4}$	Windsor	No. 287
21 April 1366	Windsor	No. 288
1 August 1368	Bagshot	No. 270
17 September 1368	Windsor	No. 270
8 November 1369	Bagshot	No. 270
14 July 1370	Wokingham	No. 272
11 July 1372	Wokingham	No. 271, 290
26 April 1375	Wokingham	No. 291[3]

SURREY

DATE	PLACE	RECORD
9 May 1363	Guildford	No. 317
21 April 1366	Windsor	No. 317
1 August 1368	Bagshot	No. 270
17 September 1368	Windsor	No. 270
8 November 1369	Bagshot	No. 270
4 April 1370	Guildford	No. 272
14 July 1370	Wokingham	No. 272
23 February 137$\frac{1}{2}$	Wanborough	No. 317, 271
4 July 1372	Guildford	No. 317, 271
26 April 1373	Windsor	No. 317, 274
17 July 1373	Windsor	No. 274

It will be seen from this table that two inquisitions were sometimes held in the same year. Whether or not this was the usual practice

[1] Some of these are the original records of inquisitions, and others are the enrolments of them. In some cases both the original record and the enrolment still exist.

[2] All the documents in this column belong to the class *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*

[3] At this inquisition two agisters are included among the forest officers. Although mentioned in the Statute of the year 1306 (see p. xlv), the agisters were seldom included among the forest officers by whose oaths the inquisitions were made. It is possible that in many forests, even where pigs and cattle were agisted, there were no agisters and that their work was performed by the foresters.

can only be ascertained from a careful study of the dates of inquisitions in other forests. Fewer inquisitions, however, held in other forests have survived to the present day than is the case in the forest of Windsor.

General inquisitions, such as those just described, were certainly not the swanimotes authorised by the Charter of the Forest. The swanimotes there mentioned were to be held three times a year at specified dates; and certain forest officers and none other were to be distrained to come to them. On the other hand, the general inquisitions were held at irregular intervals; and they were usually made before the justice of the forest by the regarders and a body of jurors as well as by the officers mentioned in the Charter. Moreover the authorised swanimotes were clearly not intended to form an essential part of the forest procedure, as they were not to be held except in those counties in which they were wont to be held [1]; but the general inquisitions of the fourteenth century were held in all the counties in which there were forests and formed the basis of the forest procedure.

It is probable that the wardens of the reign of John were in the habit of summoning the inhabitants and officers of their forests to come to assemblies, called swanimotes, for no other purpose than that of amercing those who failed to come. To check this abuse the Charter declared that swanimotes were only to be held on certain occasions and in a particular manner. The inquisition by four neighbouring townships may have been an existing institution which was not intended [2] to be abolished by the Charter, or it may have been introduced shortly after the grant of the Charter, as an institution without which the beasts of the forest could not be preserved. But, however it arose, it was well established in the middle of the reign of Henry III., and it was as a development of these inquisitions by the four townships that the general inquisition came into being.

The following is an example of a general inquisition, of the year 1369:

[1] As to this see the concluding words of chapter eight of the Charter of the Forest printed on p. xxviii above.

[2] The terms of the complaints made by the inhabitants of the Forest of Mendip in the year 1277, seem to show that they did not consider that the Charter of the Forest prohibited inquisitions by four neighbouring townships when a beast had been found dead or maimed. They complained that notwithstanding the Charter the warden was in the habit of summoning the freemen and townships to inquisitions, 'although there is no beast dead or maimed nor any lawful indictment by a forester or any other certain man according to the assize of the forest' (see p. 127 below).

Inquisicio[1] facta apud Uppingham die[2] Martis proxima post festum apostolorum Petri et Pauli anno regni regis Edwardi tercii post conquestum quadragesimo tercio coram Petro atte Wode, locum tenente Iohannis[3] de Foxle, custodis foreste domini regis citra Trentam de statu foreste de Rotland' in comitatu Rotland per sacramentum Henrici Boyuille locum tenentis Iohannis Wardedeu senescalli foreste predicte . . . .[4] forestariorum . . . .[5] uiridariorum . . . .[6] regardatorum . . . .[6] liberorum tenencium infra metas foreste . . . .[6] liberorum tenencium extra metas foreste; qui dicunt quod Iohannes Wardu et Willelmus Wardu, uicarius ecclesie de Bodyham, ocupauerunt quamdam porcionem terre de solo domini regis uocatam Calkeleghes in Leyefeld' continentem per estimacionem triginta acras terre et proficuum inde recepere per sex annos, uidelicet, ab anno regni regis nunc tricesimo septimo usque annum quadragesimum tercium et ualet per annum xiij sol. iiij den'.

Item dicunt quod idem Iohannes succidit de magnis ramis quercuum domini regis tam in parco quam extra per annos supradictos ad ualenciam lx sol'.

Item dicunt quod idem Iohannes et Alicia uxor eius feoffati sunt de balliua senescalcie foreste Rotland' per Robertum Wardu et Iohannem Porte per simplicem factum in patria sine breue uel licencia domini regis, tenenda dicto Iohanni Wardu et Alicie uxori eius et heredibus dicti Iohannis Wardu imperpetuum.

Item dicunt quod Iohannes Wardu custos dicte foreste afferat presentaciones presentatas[7] per forestarios in swanemotis[8] dicte foreste per semetipsum absque aliquibus aliis afferatoribus ad hoc iuratis et hoc ad domum suam[9] propriam[10] extra comitatum sine presencia uiridariorum dicte foreste, ubi de iure et consuetudine a tempore quo non exstat memoria solebant afferari in swanimotis in presencia uiridariorum et per homines iuratos; et sic per extorcionem leuari fecit vj sol' viij den' ad usum suum proprium de diuersis hominibus patrie predicte.

Item dicunt quod predictus Iohannes Wardu, custos dicte foreste, preposuit quemdam Robertum Brerlee in officium forestarii in foresta predicta, ubi dictus Robertus Brerlee antea indictatus fuit de transgressione uenacionis in foresta predicta, et ea de causa ab officio forestarii remotus, manutenendo[11] ipsum in transgressione predicta contra assisam foreste.

The verdict of the officers and freemen in this inquisition relates solely to the misdeeds of the warden of the forest. Any offence,

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, No. 307.
[2] 3 July 1369.
[3] John of Foxley was appointed warden of the forest South of the Trent by letters patent dated 26 April 1368 (see Fine Roll 169, m. 15). At this date the justices of the forests north and south of the Trent were styled wardens, and the wardens of the individual forests were distinguished by the title of stewards (see p. xv above). It will be observed that John Wardeu is described in one part of this inquisition as steward and in another part as warden.
[4] Six names.
[5] Two names.
[6] Twelve names.
[7] MS. 'presentatos.'
[8] These swanimotes were almost certainly the courts of attachment for the forest. See p. xxxvii above.
[9] MS. 'suum.'
[10] MS. 'proprium.'
[11] MS. 'matenendo.'

however, against the laws of the forest might be proved in the forest inquisitions, which therefore supply a vast body of material for the history of the forests in the fourteenth century. The following are a few further extracts from inquisitions [1] made in the forest of Rutland towards the close of the reign of Edward III.

6 October 1365. Quod I. de T. die [2] Martis proxima ante festum Natiuitatis beate Marie interfecit unum prikettum cum arcu et sagittis in balliua de Beaumond in foresta predicta et inde fecit uoluntatem.

Quod T. le R. habuit tempore pessone sex porcellos sine agistamento agistatorum precii in toto iij sol.

21 May 1372. Quod L. H. equitabat in Leyefeld cum leporariis ligatis superuidendo balliuam suam die [3] Lune proxima ante festum Omnium Sanctorum anno predicti domini regis xliiij ; et predicti leporarii fregerunt dictum ligamen et ceciderunt super unam damam ; et dictus L. in auxilium eiusdem dame dictos leporarios fugauit a dama predicta, quam quidem damam dictus L. nequiter uulnerauit et recessit.

18 March 137$\frac{2}{3}$. Quod prior de Landa habet parcum iuxta forestam domini regis predicti non inclusum ; utrum sit ad nocumentum uel non ignorant, quia fere domini regis intrare possunt et redire.

IV.

THE FOREST EYRE.

The Forest Eyre of the year 1255.

The forest eyre [4] was a court called into being by the king's letters patent appointing justices to hear and determine pleas of the forest in a particular county or group of counties. Thus in the year 1255 William le Breton, Nicholas of Romsey, Geoffrey of Lewknor and Simon of Thorp were appointed itinerant justices in the counties of Huntingdon, Northampton, Buckingham and Oxford, by letters patent [5] which may be translated as follows :

The king to the archbishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons, knights, freemen and all others of the counties of Huntingdon Northampton

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 307.

[2] 2 September 1365.

[3] 28 October 1370.

[4] The proceedings of the forest eyres are enrolled on oblong-shaped pieces of parchment sewn together at one end. Each piece of parchment was called a 'roll,' and the words 'primus rotulus' are often on the first roll, 'secundus rotulus' on the second, and so on. It is convenient to speak of the whole series of rolls of an eyre in any county as a 'file.' In some letters patent of 2 November 1283, we have 'uiginti et octo rotulos in uno ligamine de placitis foreste in comitatu Suthampt' de itinere Rogeri de Clifford.' (See Patent Roll 101, m. 4.) In this passage the word 'ligamen' is properly translated as 'file.'

[5] Patent Roll 65, m. 7.

Buckingham and Oxford greeting. Know ye that we have appointed our beloved and faithful William le Breton, Nicholas of Romsey, Geoffrey of Lewknor and Simon of Thorp, our justices in eyre this time for pleas of our forest in the counties aforesaid. And therefore we send you word that to the same William, Nicholas, Geoffrey and Simon as to our justices in eyre for the aforesaid pleas you be intendent and respondent in all things which to those pleas belong as is aforesaid.

In testimony whereof etc.

Witness the king at Woodstock on the first day of June.

Ten days later the king had addressed letters close[1] to the sheriffs of the counties of Huntingdon, Northampton, Oxford and Buckingham relating to the business of the eyre. The following is a translation of the Latin enrolment:

Concerning the eyre of Justices for pleas of the forest.

The king to the sheriff of Huntingdon greeting. Summon by good summoners the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons, knights and all free tenants who have lands or tenements within the metes of our forest in your bailiwick and from every town within your county within the metes of our forest in your bailiwick four men and the reeve and the foresters of the towns and all others who are wont and ought to come before justices in eyre for pleas of the forest, that they be at Huntingdon on the quinzaine[2] of the Holy Trinity in the thirty-ninth year of our reign before our beloved and faithful William le Breton, Nicholas of Romsey, Simon of Thorp and Geoffrey of Lewknor, whom we have appointed our justices in eyre for pleas of our forest in the county aforesaid, to hear and do our precept concerning those things which belong to the aforesaid pleas.

Cause also to come before our same justices all our foresters and verderers, as well those who now are as those who have been foresters and verderers since the last pleas of the forest, with all their attachments as well of the vert as of the venison, which have arisen since the last pleas of the forest and have not yet been determined, to wit, as well of those persons attached who dwell within the metes of the forest as of those who dwell outside the forest.

Cause also all the regarders of your bailiwick to come before the same justices, so that they have all their regards sealed with their seals, and also all the agisters of your same bailiwick with the agistments; and have there the summoners and this writ.

Witness the king at Clarendon the twenty-first day of May.

[1] Close Roll 70, m. 12 *d.*

[2] 6 June 1255. According to Bracton fifteen days must elapse between the date of the summons for a general eyre and the date of the eyre. It would seem that the same interval was observed in the case of a forest eyre:

'Facta coram iusticiariis itinerantibus generali summonicione ad certos diem et locum que ad minus continere debet spacium quindecim dierum.' (*De Legibus Anglie*, Rolls Series, ii. 234.)

In the same manner an order is sent to the sheriff of Northampton that on the day which the same justices shall make known to him he cause to come etc. at Northampton. Witness as above.

To the sheriff of Oxford that at the day etc. at Oxford.

To the sheriff of Buckingham that at the day etc. at Buckingham.

The four justices in eyre began their work at Huntingdon[1] on the 6th June, and finished it before the 20th June, when they had arrived at Northampton and had begun to hear pleas relating to the forests of Rockingham[2] and Cliffe. We cannot say how long they were so engaged at Northampton, but it is probable that they adjourned for a vacation after they had been there two or three weeks, for they can hardly have had sufficient business to occupy their time in this way until the 30th September when we again find them at Northampton.[3] At this date they seem to have begun hearing pleas relating to the forests of Whittlewood and Salcey, which lay partly in the county of Northampton and partly in the county of Buckingham. While at Northampton, however, the justices seem to have been concerned with those pleas only which related to the parts of the forest of Whittlewood which lay in Northamptonshire, leaving those relating to the parts in Buckinghamshire for subsequent consideration. On the other hand, they heard all the pleas[4] relating to the parts of the forest of Salcey which were in Buckinghamshire as well as those which were in Northamptonshire while they were at Northampton. The reason for this difference in procedure may have been that considerable portions of Whittlewood lay in both counties while nearly the whole of Salcey lay in the county of Northampton.

On the 15th November 1255, the same four justices were at Buckingham hearing pleas of the parts of the forest of Whittlewood and Bernwood which lay in Buckinghamshire[5]; and on the 24th January

[1] The pleas of the venison heard at Huntingdon are printed on pp. 11 to 26 below.

[2] The pleas relating to the venison in the forest of Rockingham are printed on pp. 27 to 38 below.

[3] The pleas of the forests of Whittlewood and Salcey are recorded on a separate file, to which the reference is *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 70. This file has no general heading on any of its rolls; but the pleas of the forest of Whittlewood, which begin in the middle of a roll, have above them the words, 'De balliua de Witlewode; de in crastino sancti Michaelis.' The following words on roll 1 *d* of the Buckingham eyre (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 2) show that the justices were at Westminster on 13 October 1255: 'A die sancti Michaelis in quindecim dies anno etc. tricesimo nono quando iusticiarii preceptu domini regis fuerunt apud Westm'.'

[4] An inquisition is recorded on these rolls to have been made by the townships of Lathbury, Gayhurst, Haversham and Hanslope, all in the county of Buckingham, and forest of Salcey, concerning the taking of a buck, in Little Lenford in the same county. (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 70, *Roll* 3.)

[5] The rolls of the eyre in this county are headed: 'Placita foreste in comitatu Buk' apud Buk' die Lune proxima post festum sancti Martini anno regni Henrici

$125\frac{5}{6}$ they were at Oxford[1] hearing pleas of the forests of Whichwood and Shotover and that part of the forest of Bernwood which lay in Oxfordshire.

Three days after their arrival at Oxford William le Breton and his colleagues were appointed[2] justices in eyre for pleas of the forest in the counties of Berkshire, Rutland and Essex; and on the same day[3] letters close were addressed to the sheriffs of Essex, Rutland, Berkshire and Surrey in the same form as those which were sent to the sheriff of Huntingdon on the 1st June of the preceding year. As there was but one forest in the counties of Surrey and Berkshire, frequently called the forest[4] of Windsor, it is improbable that the king ever intended a session in eyre to be held in one county and not in the other. There can be little doubt, therefore, that the word 'Surreia' was accidentally omitted from the enrolment of the letters patent of the 28th January, more especially as letters close were, as we have seen, addressed on that day to the sheriff of Surrey as well as to the sheriffs of Essex, Rutland and Berkshire.

So far the eyre rolls have enabled us to state positively the days on which the justices began their sessions in the different counties which they visited. At the head of the first eyre roll of each county we have some such words as 'Pleas[5] of the forest in the county of Huntingdon on the quinzaine of the Holy Trinity in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of King Henry the son of King John before William le Breton . . . . justices itinerating for pleas of the forest in the county of Huntingdon.' But as the rolls of the eyre of William le Breton and his fellows in Essex, Berkshire and Surrey no longer exist, it is impossible to trace their movements through these counties with any precision. We know, however, from the rolls[6] of the Rutland eyre that they were holding pleas in Rutland on the 12th June 1256; and an entry[7] on the same rolls shows that they intended to

quadragesimo coram . . . iusticiariis assignatis ad placita foreste in eodem comitatu.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 2.)

[1] The heading of the rolls of the Oxfordshire eyre is as follows: "Placita foreste apud Oxon' coram . . . die Lune proxima post octabas sancti Hyllarii anno regni regis Henrici filii regis Iohannis quadragesimo.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 251.)

[2] Patent Roll 67, m. 17.

[3] Close Roll 74, m. 16 *in dorso.*

[4] This forest was sometimes called the forest of Colynridge, a name which has perhaps become by corruption Cobham Ridge. The district which is now known by the latter name seems to be identical with the one to which the ancient name was properly applied.

[5] See p. 11 below.

[6] The general heading of the Rutland eyre is: 'Placita uenacionis coram Willelmo Briton' . . . . apud Okham in comitatu Roteland' in crastino sancte Trinitatis anno regni regis Henrici quadragesimo.' The reference to the rolls of the eyre in this county is *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 139.

[7] 'Ideo mandatum est uicecomiti Leyc' quod distringat dictum R. quod habeat eum coram iusticiariis itinerantibus ad placita foreste apud Rading' a die sancti Iohannis

be at Reading on the 8th July. We may therefore assume that they held a session in eyre in Essex in the spring, after leaving Oxford and before going into Rutland, and another session in Berkshire and Surrey in the autumn after leaving Rutland.

On the 17th October 1256 the king sent letters patent [1] to William le Breton and his fellows appointing them justices in another group of counties. By a strange error the enrolment of the letters patent omits the names of these counties, and has instead the words 'in predictis comitatibus.' It is probable that the counties mentioned in the original letters patent were Hampshire and Wiltshire, as there was a forest eyre in both of these counties in the following year. Rolls of the Hampshire and Wiltshire eyre still exist; but they happen to be peculiar in having no headings [2] giving the dates at which the justices began to hear their pleas. Internal evidence, however, proves that the sessions [3] in eyre in these counties, which comprised a large number of forests, were held in the year 1257.

The history of the rest of the eyre is not obscured by the want of documentary evidence. We learn from a memorandum [4] on the Close Roll of 41 Hen. III. that William le Breton, Nicholas of Romsey, Geoffrey of Lewknor and Alexander de Montfort (who took the place of Simon of Thorp) were directed to hold pleas of the forests of Dorset at Dorchester on the 12th November 1257. It appears, however, from the rolls [5] of the eyre that the justices actually began their work on the 7th November. On the 26th November they were hearing pleas [6] of the Somerset forests, having been constituted justices for the purpose by letters [7] patent dated the 8th November; and on the 20th January 1258, they were at Gloucester hearing pleas [8] of the forest

Baptiste in quindecim dies.' There is a similar entry on the rolls of the Oxford eyre. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 251, *Roll* 2 *d.*)

[1] Patent Roll 67, m. 1.

[2] Although there is no general heading to the rolls of the Wiltshire eyre, the following special heading occurs on one of the rolls, which contains some transcripts of forest charters: 'Transcriptum cartarum in comitatu Wiltes' de itinere R. Walarund, W. le Bretun, N. de Romes' et G. de Leukenour' apud Wilton' anno regni regis Henrici quadragesimo primo.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 198, *Roll* 20.) Robert Walerand was justice of the forest south of the Trent at this time, but he took no part in the forest eyre in any of the other counties (except perhaps Hampshire). He was probably merely filling the place of Simon of Thorp, which was afterwards taken by Alexander de Montfort.

[3] The letters patent of the bishop of Salisbury extracted from the rolls and printed on p. lxxxix below show that the Wiltshire eyre almost certainly took place after 15 June 1257.

[4] Close Roll 75, m. 1 *d.*

[5] The heading of the Dorset eyre rolls is as follows: 'Placita foreste in comitatu Dors' coram Willelmo Britone, Nicholao de Romes', Galfrido de Leukenour' et Alexandro de Monteforti in crastino sancti Leonardi anno regni regis quadragesimo secundo.' The reference to these rolls is *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 10.

[6] See p. 41 below.

[7] Patent Roll 69, m. 17 *d.*

[8] There is no general heading to the rolls of the Gloucestershire eyre, but there is a special heading to the essoins:

'Essonia capta coram Willelmo Briton',

of Dean, pursuant to letters patent[1] dated the 15th December 1257.

We have now traced the progress of the justices through a group of thirteen counties. There remain four others, all lying south of the river Trent, in which there were royal forests of considerable extent; namely, Staffordshire, Salop, Worcestershire and Herefordshire.[2] William le Breton, however, and his fellows never held a session in eyre in any of these counties. There are no rolls which record pleas held by them there; nor are there any entries on the Patent and Close Rolls, which relate to their appointment as justices. On the other hand, by letters patent[3] dated the 3rd December 1261, the king appointed Alan la Zouche, Nicholas of Romsey and William of Powick justices in eyre for pleas of the forest in the counties of Stafford, Salop, and Hereford, and on the 15th February in the following year he sent letters close[4] to the sheriff of Worcester directing him to summon all those who were wont and ought to attend the forest eyre to come before the same justices.

The rolls of the forest pleas[5] held in the counties of Worcester and Salop in the year 1262 pursuant to these letters patent still exist, and, as they contain many pleas of the venison of an earlier date than 1255, they show clearly that no eyre was held by William le Breton and his fellows in either of these counties after they left Gloucester in 1258. The same point is established in the case of Staffordshire by an official transcript[6] of the eyre of Alan la Zouche in 1261, made for the use of the king some forty years later. In the case of Herefordshire the rolls of the year 1262, which might establish in the same way that there was no eyre in that county in 1258, no longer exist. We may assume, however, that, as in the case of Staffordshire, Worcestershire and Salop, there was no eyre in that year.

There can be little doubt that the king originally intended William le Breton and his fellows to hold forest pleas, in all the

Nicholao de Romes', Galfrido de Leukenore iusticiariis itinerantibus ad placita foreste apud Gloucestr' in octabis sancti Hyllarii anno quadragesimo secundo.'

There is a similar heading to the first roll of the venison at the same eyre. The reference to these rolls is *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 28.

[1] Patent Roll 69, m. 15.

[2] There were also small tracts of forest in Warwickshire and Leicestershire which were on the borders of Worcestershire and Rutland respectively. It is probable that the pleas of the forest in Warwickshire were heard at Worcester, and those of the forest in Leicestershire at Oakham.

[3] Patent Roll 75, m. 19.

[4] Close Roll 82, m. 15 *d.*

[5] The reference to the eyre in Worcestershire is *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 227, and to the eyre in Salop *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 145.

[6] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 183.

counties of England south of the river Trent in which there were forests. They were to begin with the forests in the counties of Huntingdon, Northampton, Buckingham and Oxford, and to journey through the other forests in the order which the king should from time to time direct. They probably held no pleas in Staffordshire, Worcestershire, Herefordshire and Salop, because their services were wanted elsewhere. It must be remembered that the year 1258 was an eventful one in English history. A parliament met in London on the 9th April, and on the 2nd May the king assented to the election of twenty-four persons to prepare a scheme of reforms which were to be submitted to an adjourned session of the Parliament at Oxford on the 10th June. The council of twenty-four drew up the famous Provisions of Oxford, to which the king gave his consent on the 12th October. While events[1] such as these were taking place, it is easy to believe that the presence of the justices in eyre or of some of them was required at the parliament, more especially as certain of the grievances of the barons related to the king's forests.

The Periodicity of the Eyre.

We have already seen that in December 1261 the king appointed Alan la Zouche and two other justices in eyre to hold pleas of the forest in the group of four counties, which William le Breton left unvisited in the year 1258. After Alan la Zouche finished his work in this group, the king by letters patent[2] dated the 10th April 1262, appointed him and his two fellows justices in eyre for pleas of the forest in Huntingdonshire, Northamptonshire and Buckinghamshire. It would seem that the king intended them to hold forest pleas in all the counties of England in which there were forests. But just as the eyre of William le Breton came to an end without pleas being held in four counties south of the Trent in which there were forests, so again the eyre[3] of Alan la Zouche was incomplete, and a few

[1] As to these matters of history, see Stubbs, *Constitutional History*, ed. 1875, vol. ii, p. 73.

[2] Patent Roll 75, m. 12.

[3] No records of this eyre now exist, except the rolls of the Wiltshire eyre, to which the reference is *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 199, and of Worcestershire, Salop and Stafford, to which the references have been given above. There is, however, a roll of fines and amercements which show that there was an eyre before Alan la Zouche and his fellows in Essex in 47 Hen. iii. (See *For. Proc.*, *Ex. Q. R.*, *Bundle* i., *No.* 20.) The rolls of the eyre held in 53 Hen. iii. (see p. lvii note 1 below) show conclusively that no eyre was held by Alan Zouche in 46 Hen. iii., except in those counties for which records of an eyre in that year still exist, and except also in the counties of Hereford, Oxford, and perhaps also Buckingham and Northampton.

counties only were visited by him. This, again, was probably owing to political reasons.

There was one more eyre[1] in the reign of Henry III. The justices[2] were Roger of Clifford, Matthew de Colombières, Nicholas of Romsey and Reynold of Oakley. It began in the year 53 Hen. III., and continued to the end of the reign, extending over nearly all the counties of England south of the Trent in which there were forests. It was probably the death of the king, in 1272, which prevented the justices from visiting the remaining counties. Thus it seems that in the latter half of the reign of Henry III., three forest eyres were held south of the Trent at intervals of about seven years. The first began in 39 Henry III., the second in 46 Henry III., and the third in 53 Henry III. In some counties the interval was longer and in some shorter, but it would seem that seven years was supposed to be the proper interval between one eyre and another. It was a recognised rule[3] that this was the shortest interval between successive eyres of justices for pleas of the crown and common pleas; and it is probable that the holding of the forest eyre was considered subject to the same limitation.

In the reign of Edward I. the eyres began to be held much more irregularly; thus there was one in Sherwood Forest in 1287, and not another[4] until 1334. This was an exceptionally long interval, but in all the forests the intervals became longer and longer.

The Justices in Eyre.

It was usual for the justices of the forest north and south of the Trent to be placed in all commissions of eyre in their respective provinces.

[1] The records of this eyre are in the class of documents known as *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.* Their numbers in the class and the dates of the sessions in the different counties, to which the records relate, are as follows:—Rutland, 25 June 1269, No. 140. Hampshire, 30 September 1269, No. 158. Dorset, 25 November 1269, No. 11. Wiltshire, 14 January $12\frac{69}{70}$, No. 200. Somerset, 23 May 1270, No. 153. Surrey, 8 June 1270, No. 194. Gloucestershire, 6 October, 1270, No. 29. Worcestershire, 29 October 1270, No. 229. Staffordshire, 30 September 1271, No. 184. Salop, 3 November 1271, No. 147. Herefordshire, 1 December 1271, No. 35. Oxfordshire, 22 May 1272, No. 137. Northamptonshire, 30 September 1272, No. 72.

[2] They were appointed justices in eyre for pleas of the forest in the counties of Rutland, Surrey, Hants, Dorset, Somerset and Gloucester, by letters patent dated 9 June 1269. (See Patent Roll 86, m. 12.) The usual writ to the sheriffs for an eyre in the counties of Hereford and Stafford was dated 16 September 1271. (See Close Roll 92, m. 7 *d.*)

[3] As to this see Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law*, ed. 1898, vol. i., p. 202.

[4] For the date of the eyre of 1287 see p. 61, and for that of 1334 see p. 65, below. The rolls of the eyre of 1334 show that there had been no eyre since 1287.

Alan la Zouche[1] and Roger of Clifford who were included in the commissions of 46 Henry III. and 53 Henry III. respectively were justices of the forest south of the Trent, while William[2] de Vescy and Ralph de Neville, who were among the itinerant justices at Nottingham in 15 Edward I. and 8 Edward III. respectively, were justices of the forest north of the Trent. It was a remarkable feature of the eyre of William le Breton which began in June 1255 and ended in the spring of 1258, that neither he nor any one of his colleagues was a justice of the forest. At the beginning of the eyre Arnold[3] de Bois held the office, but on the 1st September 1256, he was succeeded by Robert Walerand[4] who was still justice of the forest south of the Trent when the eyre closed.

The forest justices in eyre were usually men of some position. William le Breton[5] held lands of the king in chief; and had been sheriff of the county of Essex. He was a lawyer who from time to time filled various offices. He was one of the justices assigned for the custody of the Jews in 36 Henry III. He was more than once a justice in eyre for pleas of the crown and common pleas, and he was for many years constantly employed as a justice specially commissioned to take particular assizes.

Geoffrey of Lewknor, one of the colleagues of William le Breton, had a very similar career. He was at one time a justice assigned for the custody of the Jews; he was also more than once a justice in eyre for pleas of the crown and common pleas; and he was frequently commissioned to take particular assizes. Unlike William le Breton, who was only an itinerant forest justice late in life, Geoffrey of Lewknor was employed in this way early in his official career.

Nicholas of Romsey was a man who seems never to have performed any important duties, either judicial or administrative, except as an itinerant forest justice. He was one of the colleagues of William le Breton in 1255, of Alan la Zouche in 1262, of Roger

[1] Alan la Zouche and Roger of Clifford were appointed by letters patent dated 12 June 1261 and 8 August 1265 respectively. (See Patent Roll 74, m. 10, and Patent Roll 82, m. 11.) It is probable that Roger of Clifford was not a justice in eyre in all the counties, as he was succeeded in the office of justice of the forest south of the Trent by Roger of Clifford junior, who was appointed to the office by letters patent dated 1 August 1270. (See Fine Roll 67, m. 5.) It should be noticed that at the Somerset eyre which began on 23 May 1270 the place of Roger of Clifford was taken by Henry of Burghill. (See p. 42 below.)

[2] William de Vescy and Ralph de Neville were appointed justices of the forest north of the Trent by letters patent dated 30 June 1285 and 9 October 1311 respectively. (See Patent Roll 103, m. 12, and Fine Roll 131, m. 8.)

[3] See p. 15, n. 3, below.

[4] See p. xvi, note 3.

[5] For particulars concerning William le Breton and his fellows, see Foss's *Judges of England*. As to William le Breton see also *Britton*, ed. 1867, pp. xxi and xxii.

of Clifford in 1269 and of Roger of Clifford the younger[1] in 1277. It was probably thought desirable to include in a commission where possible some person who had acted as a forest justice in a previous eyre.

Pleas of the Vert.

The enrolment of the proceedings of a forest eyre is usually divided into several sections, of which the two most important are entftled 'Pleas of the Vert,' and 'Pleas of the Venison' respectively. The language in which the pleas of the vert are recorded is of a monotonous character. Usually the nature of the trespass is not mentioned, and the trespasser is merely stated to be liable for a small sum of money 'for vert.' If the trespass was committed in the king's demesne, the additional words 'in dominico' are entered on the roll. The following is a portion of the record[2] of the pleas of the vert in the forest of Huntingdon at the eyre of July 1255.

PLACITA DE UIRIDI

De Ricardo Truke de Dulinton' pro uiridi	xijd.
De Rogero Fabr' de Pyrie pro eodem	xijd.
De Willelmo le Pestur de Pyr' pro plegio eiusdem Rogeri	xijd.
De Galfrido Rede de eadem pro eodem	xijd.
De Albino Loom de Brampton' pro uiridi	xijd.
De Alano Kyng' de eadem pro eodem	xijd.
De Laurencio filio Oseberti de Suho pro eodem	xijd.
De Godefrido filio Roberti de Suho pro plegio	xijd.
De Rogero filio Emme de Bugeton' pro eodem	xijd.
De Willelmo de Pentham in Suho pro uiridi	xijd.
De Laurencio filio Gileberti in Suho pro plegio	xijd.
De Thoma filio Walteri de Dudincton' pro eodem	xijd.
De Augustino Paum' de Aukenbir' pro uiridi	xijd.
De Godefrido de Suho pro uiridi	xijd.
De Laurencio de Suho pro plegio	fugitiuus; nichil.
De Willelmo de Pentham pro eodem	alibi
De Henrico de Litlehey pro uiridi	xijd.
De Rogero filio Thome de Raueleye pro plegio eiusdem	Ram'
De Roberto le Carpent' de eadem pro eodem	
De Ricardo ad Molendinum de Dylinton' pro uiridi	xijd.
De Willelmo de Wynewich pro uiridi	pauper

[1] Roger of Clifford and three others were appointed justices in eyre for pleas of the forest in the county of Essex by letters patent dated 4 February $127\frac{6}{7}$. (See Patent Roll 95, m. 22.) The reference to the rolls of the eyre held pursuant to these letters patent is *For. Proc. Tr. of Rec., No.* 12. The same justices afterwards held sessions in eyre in other counties.

[2] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 41, *Roll* 2.

De Henrico filio Walteri de eadem pro plegio . . .	xijd.
De Gileberto filio Ranulfi de eadem pro eodem . .	mortuus
De Roberto de Elyngton' pro uiridi	xijd.
De Roberto filio Sweyn pro plegio	Rames'

The total number of entries is seventy-six, of which the remainder are in one or other of the forms just printed, except the four following.

De Waltero preposito de Elynton pro uiridi [1] . . .	iiijs.
De Ricardo Ulf' de Wodehurst quia fuit inuentus in foresta contra assisam	Ram'
De Roberto filio Uyel de Grafham quia cepit sex quercus sine uisu et liberata	xxs.
De abbate de Rames' pro boscis suis uastatis de ueteri et pro defalta forestariorum suorum	xx marce

The words 'pro plegio' seem to have been used of the pledges who failed to produce a trespasser at the forest eyre. Where a sum of money is placed opposite a name and that name occurs again in the list, the word 'alibi' is placed after the name instead of a second sum, and the first sum represents the total sum for which the trespasser is liable for all his trespasses. Probably the word 'Ramesia,' written instead of a sum of money, means that the trespasser against whose name it is placed was a tenant of the abbot of Ramsey, who made fine at the eyre for all the trespasses of his tenants.[2]

The Pleas of the Venison.

The forest eyre was chiefly concerned with fines and amercements for breaches of the laws of the forest. It was almost as much a financial assembly as a court of law. The records of its proceedings are memoranda of sums of money owing to the king rather than registers of process and judgments. For this reason the pleas of the venison, which might be expected to throw some light on the manners and customs of the English peasantry, are disappointing. In general they record those facts only from which the king might derive a fine or an amercement. Often [3] they tell us nothing of a trespass, except the sum by which the trespasser made fine for his release from prison. It is even difficult to deduce from the mass of common form in which the pleas are recorded the nature of much of the ordinary process adopted in the administration of the forest law.

[1] The word 'Dominicum' is written in the margin of the roll opposite this entry.

[2] For pleas of the vert of the reign of Ed. iii. see p 67 below.

[3] See, for example, the case of Walter the son of Robert Perchead on p. 36 below.

It was the usual practice[1] for the first enrolment to begin with some such words as, 'It is presented by the foresters and verderers, to wit . . . and proved;' while the first words of subsequent enrolments were, 'It is presented and proved by the same persons.' Apparently they mean that the presentment was made by the foresters and verderers in the forest eyre, and that the fact was proved by the production of the record of a special inquisition. We may search in vain for any signs of a jury[2] at the forest eyre. Sometimes, indeed, the townships[3] were required to come before the justices so that they might certify them of the fact found by them in the inquisition; but there is nothing in the eyre rolls, which can lead us to suppose that in ordinary cases they were consulted by the court. The record of the inquisition seems to have been considered a satisfactory proof of the facts which it contained, without the aid of further evidence.

If the forest officers made a presentment which was inconsistent with their records, they were either imprisoned or amerced according to the gravity of their offence. An example[4] of a verderer being imprisoned occurred in the Northampton eyre of 1255, when it was presented and proved that a certain 'beast' was taken beneath the hedge of the castle of Rockingham by the men of the parson of Easton. The word 'beast' is vague, but it can hardly be doubted that it meant 'beast of the forest.' Yet one of the verderers, John Lovet contradicted his roll, by saying that the beast which was taken was a certain sheep, and on being convicted of this by the verderers, foresters and his other fellows, was sent to prison. Probably the justices asked him to explain the word 'beast' and he gave a false explanation with a view to screening a friend or avoiding censure for

[1] It is difficult to say precisely what was the procedure followed in the matter of presentments at the forest eyre. On p. 22 below, it is stated that the verderers ought not to enrol anything in their rolls except a presentment of the foresters. It seems clear, however, notwithstanding this statement, that they might enrol inquisitions. The presentments appear to have been entered on the rolls, as memoranda: that is to say, they were not expressed to be presentments. See, for example, the case on p. 83. In such cases there seems to have been no inquisition or trial to which the word 'conuictum' can refer. It is a matter of doubt whether the foresters and verderers made their presentments jointly or severally. It may even be the case that the presentment of the verderers was the presentment of the foresters, on the ground that the former could only enrol what the latter had presented to them. In the Pickering eyre of 8 Ed. iii. the introductory words are not in the usual form. Thus: 'Presentatum est per predictos forestarios et conuictum per uiridarios' (Duchy of Lancaster Miscellaneous Book, No. 1 fo. 203 r°.) See also the following note.

[2] At the Pickering eyre of 8 Ed. iii. the introductory words to the pleas of the venison in some of the wards are as follows:

'Presentatum est per forestarios et duodecim iuratores warde predicte et conuictum per uiridarios.' (Duchy of Lancaster Miscellaneous Book, No. 1, fo. 102 r°, 104 v°.) The mention of jurors in this case is quite exceptional.

[3] See pp. 71, 72 below. [4] See p. 35 below.

an inadequate enrolment. The colloquy between the verderer and justices would help us to understand some of the details of the procedure of the court, but nothing so frivolous adorns the records of a forest eyre. This and other causes, however, tend to show that when any further inquiry [1] was made before the itinerant justices about the matters presented to them, it was by way of certification rather than of rehearing.[2]

We have already seen [3] that the townships were amerced in the forest eyre for not having come fully to make an inquisition, if they had been unable to ascertain anything about the matters for which they were summoned or anything sufficient to satisfy the justices. In many of the forest eyre rolls the amercements of the townships are written above their names in the clauses which state their defaults. But sometimes instead of seeing a sum of money thus interlineated, we see the word 'alibi' in its place. This, however, only happens where the township, above the name of which the word 'alibi' is found, has aleady been amerced for not having come to some other forest inquisition. Thus at the Huntingdon eyre of 1255 the townships [4] of Great Stukeley, Abbots Ripton, Hartford and King's Ripton were amerced for not having come fully to a special inquisition held [5] on the 22nd March $125\frac{4}{5}$, and the amercement of each of these townships is duly written above its name in the eyre roll. In the month of April, 1255, another special inquisition was held by the townships of King's Ripton, Abbots Ripton, Hartford and Little Stukeley. At the eyre held shortly afterwards, all these townships were put in mercy [6] for not having come fully to the inquisition. But instead of a sum of money the word 'alibi' appears in the eyre roll above the names of three of the townships—namely, Kings Ripton, Abbots Ripton and Hartford—all of which had been amerced for not coming fully to the inquisition of the 22nd March $125\frac{4}{5}$. On the other hand, the amerce-

[1] A good example of certification by the verderers occurs in the Northamptonshire eyre roll of 1256:

'Philippus de Stanes homo domini Hugonis filii Radulfi inuentus fuit in parco de Clyue cum arcu et quatuor sagittis barbatis et cum uno cane et duobus garcionibus. . . . Et Rogerus de Fodringhe et Iohannes Caperun, uiridarii, requisiti de garcionibus, qui fuerunt et quo deuenerunt, dicunt quod fugerunt nec potuit inquiri qui fuerunt. Requisiti de canibus, cuiusmodi canes essent, et Rogerus de Fodringhe dicit quod brachettus et Iohannes Caperun dicit quod fuit mastinus. Et quia sunt uiridarii et debent concordare et ueritatem dicere in omnibus et modo uariant in sermone coram iusticiariis, ideo comittuntur gaolle.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 68, *Roll* 1.)

[2] In the record of the inquisition printed on p. 72 below, it is expressly stated that the four townships were to come before the justices to certify them.

[3] See pp. xliii, xliv above.

[4] See p. 13 below.

[5] See p. 78 below.

[6] See p. 15. The record of the inquisition itself no longer exists.

ment of the fourth township, Little Stukeley, which had not already been amerced for not having come fully to some inquisition, is duly recorded on the eyre roll.

The amercements of the townships varied considerably in severity. At the Huntingdon eyre of 1255 the township of Yaxley, which is recorded[1] as having failed to come fully to an inquisition on one occasion only, was amerced six marks. On the other hand, Brampton, which failed in this way no less than six[2] times, was only amerced two marks. The smallest amercements for a single default were of half a mark[3] each.

On the file of the rolls of the Huntingdon eyre the amercements of trespassers against the venison were written above their names as in the case of the townships. But on some files of eyre rolls none of the amercements, whether of townships or of trespassers to the venison, were interlineated in this way. For example, on the rolls[4] of the Northampton eyre of 1255 there is no interlineation of amercements among the pleas of the venison, but on one roll[5] of the file there is a list of fines and amercements for trespasses against the venison.

Just as the eyre rolls only inform us that a special inquisition has been held when the townships which held it were amerced for not coming fully, so they only inform us that a trespasser has been imprisoned to secure his appearance at the forest eyre when some event has happened which has given rise to an amercement. Thus the record tells us of a trespasser being imprisoned when the sheriff had released him without an order[6] from the king or the chief justice of the forest; or when he had been delivered to pledges pursuant to such an order, and the pledges failed to produce him at the forest eyre. In the one case the sheriff, in the other the pledges,[7] would be amerced; and consequently the fact of the imprisonment and the subsequent default would be recorded. But if the sheriff had released his prisoner to pledges upon the receipt of a proper mandate directing him to do so, and the pledges produced him at the eyre, there would

[1] See p. 12 below.

[2] Namely, once on p. 19 below, once on p. 21, three times on p. 22, and once on p. 24.

[3] The following are examples of townships being amerced at this sum: Little Raveley (p. 18 below), Wennington (p. 18) and Woolley (p. 19).

[4] See pp. 27 to 38 below.

[5] Namely, on Roll 7, which is not printed in this volume.

[6] See the case of Alan of Maidwell on p. 28 below. The fact of the imprisonment also appears on the rolls when there was any irregularity about the delivery of the prisoner. See, for example, the case of Henry de Colleville on p. 12 below, and the case of Simon of Houghton on p. 14.

[7] See p. 35 below.

be no amercement; and consequently the fact of the imprisonment would not be recorded.

If the trespasser had never been attached or, having been attached, failed to appear before the justices in eyre, there were two modes of proceeding. Either the sheriff of the county in which he lived or had property was ordered to cause him to appear; or if he could not be found and had no property by which he could be distrained, the justices directed him to be exacted in the county court, and if he failed to appear in due course, he was outlawed. If, however, the trespasser was a beneficed clerk who had no lay fee, the order was sent to the bishop of his diocese, instead of to the sheriff, but if he had no benefice he was exacted and outlawed as if he were a layman. When the trespasser appeared, if the presentment of the verderers was in proper form, the justices almost invariably adjudged that he be sent to prison. But just as he might already have been imprisoned in order to secure his appearance before the justices, so now he was imprisoned not so much by way of punishment as for the purpose of securing payment of a fine for his ransom. In the eyre of William le Breton, the record usually states that the trespasser 'comes[1] and is detained in prison.' In some cases nothing more is said of him, but in others the record continues, 'Afterwards he came and made fine by so many marks or shillings.' In subsequent eyres, in place of the last entry we usually have,[2] 'Afterwards the aforesaid . . . being brought out of prison, made fine by so much money.' Even where the enrolment of a plea ends with the words, 'he is detained in prison,' there is generally evidence that a fine was paid. Thus, although the pleas of the venison only inform us of the imprisonment[3] of John Lovet for the false statement which we have already noticed, and say nothing of any fine for his release, yet the list of amercements[4] and fines on another roll of the same file of eyre rolls shows that he made fine by twelve marks for his mendacity and concealment. In several other instances the same list supplements the deficiencies in this respect of the enrolment of the pleas of the venison. It would seem that the clerk began enrolling

[1] A difficulty in translating may conveniently be noticed here. In some rolls the expression, 'modo non ueniunt' is used; in others 'modo non uenerunt.' Frequently, however, the verb is not extended and its first three letters only are written, so that it is difficult to say whether 'ueniunt' or 'uenerunt' is intended. It is also often impossible to say whether 'uenit' represents the present or the perfect tense. In some cases the intention of the scribe can be gathered from other passages on the same roll, but often no such assistance is to be obtained.

[2] See pp. 43, 54, 55, 56 and 57 below.

[3] See p. 35 below.

[4] On roll 7 *in dorso* there is an entry as follows: 'De Iohanne Louet, uiridario, conuicto de mendacione et concelamento duodecim marce.'

the proceedings of this eyre before they were actually concluded. It certainly was the usual practice for all or nearly all the fines made in this way to be enrolled as part of the record of their respective cases, and not be enrolled separately as in the rolls of the Northamptonshire eyre of 1255.

The justices in eyre were appointed to hear and determine pleas of the forest. But in the reign of Henry III. imprisonment for a definite period[1] was an unknown punishment. Men were detained in prison either to secure their appearance on some particular occasion, or in order that they might pay a ransom for their release. The pleas of the forest, therefore, could hardly be said to be determined until the prisoners had been ransomed. It is probable that, with rare exceptions, the prisoners made fine with the justices before they left the place where the imprisonment was adjudged. The words 'being brought out of prison,' which often preceded the words 'made fine' in the enrolment, seem to show that the assessment of the fine was a matter which required the prisoner to be before the justices for the purpose. It is most unlikely[2] that a prisoner would be taken out of his gaol in one county to make fine with the justices when they were engaged in hearing pleas in another county. We find, moreover, no trace in the eyre rolls of any such a course being adopted.

The system of ransoming prisoners was not carried out oppressively. The mere fact that there were as many as four justices was a protection against the extortion which might have been practised by a single judge. There certainly seems to have been no gross inequality in the punishments which they imposed. Heavy ransoms were, on the whole, rare; but, as far as it is possible to judge, they seem to have been imposed with good reason. John Lovet, for instance, who was ransomed for twelve marks at Northampton in 1255, no doubt had to pay a heavier ransom than most of his fellow prisoners. But he was a man of good family, and probably a knight.[3] Moreover, being a verderer, it was only proper that he should suffer an exemplary

[1] By article 9 of the Charter of the Forest a man might be imprisoned for a year and a day. The article is as follows: 'Nullus de cetero amittat uitam uel membra pro uenacione nostra; set si aliquis captus fuerit et conuictus de capcione uenacionis, grauiter redimatur, si habeat unde redimi possit; et si non habeat unde redimi possit iaceat in prisona nostra per unum annum et unum diem; et si post unum annum et unum diem plegios inuenire possit, exeat a prisona; sin autem, abiuret regnum Anglie.'

Trespassers in parks might be imprisoned for a year and day. As to this see pp. cxix–cxxi below.

[2] It is possible, however, that in some cases the justices left a county before assessing the ransoms, and returned for that purpose a short while afterwards.

[3] He and his fellow verderers are described as 'domini' on p. 100 below. See also p. 22, note 1, below.

punishment. On the other hand, we frequently find that trespassers were pardoned[1] because they were poor; and the justices seem to have taken into consideration[2] the time which a prisoner had spent in gaol before he had been released by writ to pledges until the eyre.

We can form a good idea of the system of ransom from the following list of sums paid as fines for trespasses in Guildford Park at the eyre[3] in Surrey in the year 1272:—

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Thomas de Bois	0	13	4	Peter Long	0	6	8
Ralph of Slyfield	0	6	8	John of Aldham[4] . . .	13	6	8
Alan of Slyfield	0	6	8	Andrew of Fremelesworth	0	10	0
John atte Hook	0	6	8	Geoffrey de Brayboef . .	2	13	4
John atte Down	0	6	8	John the son of Aubrey .	0	6	8
Robert le King	0	6	8	Peter of Dodleston . . .	pardoned.		

Miscellaneous Matters on the Eyre Rolls.

Besides the pleas of the venison and the vert, other matters were recorded on the eyre rolls, of which some, however, are not found on the rolls of every eyre. There was always a regard enrolled on them, the nature of which will be explained in another section of this Introduction. Again the names of those who were essoined of death were invariably enrolled. Where a trespasser[5] died before the coming of the justices in eyre, his pledges would be amerced just as if he had been alive and had failed to appear, unless his death were proved by an essoiner. The enrolment of the essoins does not disclose the nature of the proof which was required. It merely consists of the words 'Essonia de morte' followed by a series of entries, such as 'I. de W. essoniatur de morte per G. F. de W.'

[1] Cases in which the justices are expressly stated to have taken the poverty of the prisoner into consideration in settling his ransom occur on pp. 58 *bis* and 60 below. Many similar cases could be cited from other forest eyre rolls.

[2] For instances in which the justices considered the time a prisoner had already spent in prison, in settling his ransom, see cases in note 1 p. xli above and on pp. 29 and 30 below. At the Gloucestershire forest eyre of 1277 a trespasser was allowed to find two pledges only instead of six or twelve, because he had already lain in prison two and a half years:

'Manucaptores Willelmi Mile in forma predicta duo tantum, quia iacuit in prisona per duos annos et dimidium et quia pauper.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 30, *Roll* 25.)

The mainperners here mentioned were pledges that prisoner would commit no further trespasses against the venison.

[3] See pp. 54 to 61 below.

[4] It is not obvious why John of Aldham had to pay so heavy a ransom.

[5] For examples of persons being essoined of death see pp. 12, 20, 35, 41, and 56 below. The entries on the list of essoins corresponding to the two essoins mentioned on p. 56 below are as follows: 'Wilhelmus de la Hegge per Andream de la Hoke de morte. Radulfus de la Slow per Willelmum Harefot de eadem.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 194, *Roll* 1 *d.*)

Although on the eyre rolls of the reign of Henry III. charters and letters patent conferring rights and privileges within the forest were seldom enrolled, the practice of enrolling them became general in the reign of his successor, Edward I. There are more than sixty grants of this nature on the rolls[1] of the Essex eyre of 1277, which include a considerable number of twelfth century charters.

It was the duty of every owner of a wood within a forest to present his woodward to the justice of the forest, in order that he might take an oath of fealty before him concerning the king's venison. But a presentment before this official was not sufficient,[2] for at every forest eyre the owners were again required to present their woodwards to the justices in eyre, before whom they were again sworn. Sometimes a presentment was made for the first time before the warden or deputy warden of the forest, but this was only a provisional presentment until the owner and the woodward could come before the justice. It would seem from entries on the eyre rolls that on the appointment of a new justice of the forest existing woodwards were often presented[3] and sworn before him.

In most of the files of rolls of the eyre of William le Breton and his fellows in 1255 and the two following years there are entries relating to the presentment of the woodwards; but in subsequent eyres they are not to be found. The following are a few entries from the Somerset eyre[4] of 1257.

Rotulus de Wodewardis in comitatu Sumerset'.

Boscus de Ceddre episcopi Bathoniens' unde Iohannes Syward est wodewardus. Presentatus fuit primo per senescallum episcopi Willelmo[5] de Plesset', senescallo foreste de feodo, et non capitali iusticiario; ideo episcopus in misericordia et boscus capiatur in manum domini regis. Postea uenit senescallus dicti episcopi et replegiat boscum domini sui et presentat dictum Iohannem wodewardum qui iurat etc.; et remaneat donec episcopus uenerit.

Galfridus Molkweye wodewardus eiusdem episcopi de bosco de Laewod' presentatus fuit eodem modo quo Iohannes Seward', ideo etc. Postea uenit dictus senescallus ut supra et presentat dictum Galfridum, qui iurat; et remaneat.

Robertus de Roweberue, wodewardus abbatis sancti Augustini Bristoll', non fuit presentatus etc.; ideo etc. Postea abbas presentat dictum

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 12.

[2] See the case of Walter of Clanfield on p. lxviii below.

[3] See the case of William Curteis on p. lxviii below.

[4] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 152.

[5] William du Plessis was hereditary warden of the forests of Somerset. He was ancestor to Sabine Pecche, who was warden in 1300. See p. xvi, note 5, above.

Robertum wodewardum suum de bosco de Ruberg', qui iurat; et abbas replegiat boscum suum.

Abbatissa de Shaftesbur' presentat Walterum atte Pleystret' wodewardum de bosco suo de Culmeton', qui iurat.

Willelmus de Blakemor' wodewardus Symonis de Insula de bosco de Lokeston' presentatus fuit per literas patentes ipsius Symonis et iurat; et remaneat.

Willelmus de Ripariis per Willelmum [Deone] atornatum suum ad hoc presentat Willelmum le Pottere de Wynesford wodewardum ad boscum suum de Wyneford, qui iurat etc.

There is little variation in the form in which entries relating to the presentment of the woodwards are enrolled; but the following, taken from the rolls of the Buckingham eyre of 1255, illustrate other features of the law on the subject.

[1] Iohannes Duraunt wudewardus domini Rogeri de Wotton de bosco suo de Stocholt presentatus fuit coram domino R. Basset,[2] senescallo foreste, per dominum suum. Et postea presentatus erat per dictum dominum suum coram domino E. de Bosco,[3] iusticiario foreste, apud Selueston'.

Willelmus Curteis wudewardus Symonis de sancto Licio de parte bosci sui de Westbur' presentatus erat coram H.[4] predicto senescallo foreste apud Heiburn' per dominum suum. Et postea coram domino E., predicto iusticiario foreste, per dictum dominum suum. Et dominus eius modo uenit et presentat eum wudewardum suum qui iurat.

Walterus de Clanefeld wudewardus domini Iacobi le Sauuage de parte bosci sui de Westbur' presentatus fuit coram W. de Norhamt',[5] senescallo foreste, per dominum suum. Et postea coram iusticiariis dominis R. de Mohun[6] et E. de Bosco per dictum dominum eius modo uenit et presentat eum, qui iurat.

Finally it would seem that Roger of Clifford and his fellow justices[7] in eyre in 1269 and the two following years were directed to make certain inquiries the answers to which are recorded upon their rolls. It is probable that before starting on their duties they received a list of interrogatories, which resembled the chapters[8] used when justices in eyre were holding pleas of the crown. From the enrolment of the answers it would be impossible to construct the questions, but they appear to

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 2.

[2] Robert Basset was probably deputy warden only.

[3] Arnold de Bois was justice of the forest south of Trent. See p. 15, note 3, below.

[4] The person meant is Hugh of Goldingham, as to whom see p. 11, note 2, and p. 108, note 4, below.

[5] William of Northampton was deputy warden or steward of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford. See p. 31, note 6, below.

[6] Reynold de Moyon was justice of the forest south of Trent. See p. 37, note 2.

[7] See p. lvii, above.

[8] Chapters on articles of the eyre used by justices in eyre for pleas of the crown varied from eyre to eyre. One set of them is printed in *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 233.

have related, for the most part, to the acts of the forest officers. There were no recognised headings, corresponding to 'Pleas of Venison' and 'Pleas of the Vert' to describe the answers, but in the forest of Rutland they are entituled 'concerning[1] the extortions of Peter de Neville,' and similar words of description occur in the eyre rolls of other forests. These, however, were informal descriptions, which were followed by entries relating not only to extortions but to other matters, such as the title[2] of the hereditary warden and foresters in fee to their bailiwicks, and the number of riding and walking foresters in the forest. One of the interrogatories seems to have asked for the metes[3] and bounds of the forest, for on many of the eyre rolls of the counties visited by Roger of Clifford the boundaries are recorded.

No general inquiries of this kind were made by William le Breton in 1255, or by Alan la Zouche in 1262, when they and their fellows were justices in eyre; but others of similar nature were made in the eyres of the reign of Edward I. The inquiries[4] probably varied from eyre to eyre. Their actual form survives in no official document, and the answers were in general enrolled only when they led to some pecuniary profit to the king. In various unofficial documents, however, there are copies of such articles of inquiry. Perhaps the best known of them occur in the mediæval law treatise[5] known as Fleta, which is considered to have been written about the year 1290. They are there styled 'Uetera capitula de forestis' and consist of fifty-one chapters. Of these, the first eleven constitute another series of articles called the Chapters[6] of the Regard, and ought not to be joined to the remaining forty, which are interrogatories of the nature just described. These forty chapters probably represent inquiries used by the forest justices in eyre about the middle of the reign of Edward I.

[1] See pp. 44 and 55, below.

[2] See pp. 45, 46, below.

[3] See pp. 53 and 61 below.

[4] The answers to the interrogatories at the Cumberland eyre of 13 Ed. i. are arranged in nineteen paragraphs. The first words of each interrogatory are stated immediately before each answer, thus:

'Ad articulum qui forestarii vel balliui ceperint finem uel mercedem indebite pro cheminagio. Dicunt quod nullus. Et qui balliui uel forestarii de feodo ceperunt finem uel mercedem de forestariis ad ponendos eos etc. Dicunt quod omnes forestarii de feodo qui fuerunt post ultimum iter ceperunt finem pro forestariis ponendis et remouendis pro uoluntate sua. Quid et quantum, nesciunt; set non ad dampnum domini regis nec grauamen patrie. De attachiamentis factis per garciones non iuratos nichil sciunt.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 5, *Roll* 38.)

[5] *Fleta*, lib. ii., cap. xli., ed. 1685, p. 88.

[6] As to the Chapters of the Regard, see see p. lxxv below.

The Relation of the Eyre Rolls to the Rolls of Special Inquisitions.

Let us now consider in detail the relation of the rolls of the eyre to the rolls of special inquisitions. There has survived to the present day a portion of a roll of special inquisitions relating to the venison in the forest of Huntingdon during part of the reign of Henry III. It has no title, but the first entry [1] which is enrolled upon it is an inquisition dated the 4th March 124$\frac{7}{8}$ and the last [2] a memorandum dated the 28th April 1253. Its ten entries, of which seven are the records of special inquisitions and three [3] the memoranda of trespasses in the forest, follow one another in chronological order. The rolls of the Huntingdon eyre [4] of June 1255, have also survived to the present day.

These eyre rolls cover a rather wider period than the roll of special inquisitions. The earliest [5] entry among the pleas of the venison relates to a trespass committed in January 124$\frac{5}{6}$; the latest to another [6] committed in April 1255. It is probable, therefore, that two membranes, one at the top, the other at the bottom, of our roll of special inquisitions, or perhaps two distinct rolls, have been lost.

For the purpose of considering the relation which subsists between the two classes of records, the rolls of the Huntingdon eyre are not satisfactory. Unlike other records of proceedings in eyre the entries on these rolls are not in chronological order. They assist in establishing the proposition that to every entry on the roll of special inquisitions there is, in general, a corresponding entry on the eyre rolls. But they do not assist us to determine whether there can be an entry among the pleas of the venison on the eyre rolls without a corresponding entry on the roll of special inquisitions.

We learn more from two rolls of inquisitions held in the years 30 to 39 Henry III. in the forest of Rockingham. Of these one [7] consists of inquisitions and memoranda relating to events which happened during the years 30 to 34 Henry III.; the other [8] of similar entries relating to events which happened in the five following years. The contents of the earlier roll may be described as follows. There are four inquisitions and two memoranda of 30 Henry III.; two inquisitions and one memorandum of 31 Henry III.; four inquisitions of 32 Henry III.; three inquisitions and one memorandum of

[1] See p. 74 below.
[2] See p. 79 below.
[3] The three memoranda will be found on pp. 75, 78, 79 below.
[4] The pleas of the venison heard at this eyre are printed on pp. 11 to 26 below.
[5] See p. 19 below.
[6] See p. 15 below.
[7] See pp. 79 to 93 below.
[8] See pp. 94 to 116 below.

33 Henry III.; and two inquisitions of 34 Henry III. All the inquisitions and memoranda, except two, follow one another in chronological order. After the two inquisitions of 34 Henry III. there occurs a series of entries under the heading[1] 'Venison taken by the King's writ,' and this series of entries is followed by another[2] under the heading 'Venison taken without warrant.' Both series of entries are in chronological order.

There can be little doubt that the roll was transcribed from original inquisitions and memoranda for the use of the justices in eyre in the year 1255. The handwriting seems to be the same throughout. More than one ink may have been used in writing it, but there is nothing in the appearance of the roll to suggest that it was written entry by entry at the dates of the occurrences recorded upon it. The fact that one[3] of the inquisitions is out of chronological order points to the carelessness of a transcriber, while the two series of entries[4] concerning venison taken by the King's writ and without warrant, occurring as they do at the end of the chronological series of inquisitions and memoranda, are hardly consistent with piecemeal enrolment.

The first two entries[5] on the Northamptonshire eyre rolls of 1255 of pleas of the venison in the forest of Rockingham relate to trespasses which were committed in 29 Henry III.—that is to say, in the year before the date of the first entry on the roll of special inquisitions which we have just been considering. The third entry relates to a trespass which is undated. Probably a roll containing at least two inquisitions and a memorandum, to which these first three entries corresponded, once existed, and has since been lost. To each of the next thirteen entries on the eyre rolls there are corresponding entries[6] on our roll of special inquisitions and they follow one another in the same order. Even the entry[7] corresponding to the one which is out of chronological order on the roll of inquisition is out of order on the eyre rolls; an error which can hardly be purely accidental in both cases.

If the two records be carefully collated, it is hardly possible to avoid the conclusion that thirteen consecutive entries on the eyre rolls are based upon the thirteen corresponding entries on the roll of special inquisitions. It is true there may have been other records of special inquisitions which recorded the same matters as those in

[1] See p. 91 below. [2] See p. 92 below.
[3] See p. 86 below.
[4] See pp. 91 to 93 below.
[5] See pp. 27, 28 below.
[6] See pp. 28 to 32 below.
[7] See p. 30.

the roll which we now possess, and sometimes in a slightly different language. We have already seen that there were two records[1] of the same series of inquisitions held in the forest of Huntingdon. If, however, there were other records of special inquisitions held in the forest of Rockingham in the years 30 to 34 Henry III. they were not used as a basis for the eyre rolls.

There is one important point to be noticed about the Rockingham roll of special inquisitions of 30 to 34 Henry III. We have already described its contents and have counted the numbers of inquisitions and memoranda recorded in each year. If these be added together, it will be found that it contains fifteen inquisitions and four memoranda, or nineteen entries in all; whereas there are only thirteen consecutive entries on the eyre rolls which correspond to these entries on the roll of special inquisitions. Thus there are six[2] entries on the roll of inquisitions to which there are no corresponding entries on the eyre rolls. These six entries are not consecutive but are dispersed among the other inquisitions and memoranda. On the other hand, to every entry on the Huntingdon roll of special inquisitions there is a corresponding entry on the Huntingdon eyre rolls.

The difference between the two cases is probably accidental. We have already noticed that the eyre rolls contain no information which does not lead to a fine or an amercement. Thus, as we have seen,[3] we are told nothing of a forest inquisition unless the townships are amerced for not coming fully; nor are we told anything of the imprisonment of a poacher, unless the sheriff failed to produce his warrant for releasing him to pledges or the pledges failed to produce him before the justices in eyre. In the same way it would be quite unnecessary for an enrolment to be made of the proceedings in any trespass if the justices were satisfied that the townships came fully; if the sheriff duly produced his warrant for the release of a prisoner to pledges; if all the incidental requirements of the laws had been duly observed, and if, in addition, the trespasser had died and his death had been duly proved. As trespassers often died before the justices came to hold a forest eyre, the absence of any entries on the eyre rolls corresponding to six particular entries in the Rockingham roll of special inquisitions of 30 to 34 Henry III., can be most easily explained by there being no amercements in the particular cases of any person or township for defaults, and the trespassers themselves having died before the date of the eyre.

[1] See p. xli above.

[2] These six entries will be found on pp. 82, 86, 88, 89 below. Three of them occur on p. 88.

[3] See p. xliii above.

The purpose for which our second roll[1] of inquisitions was compiled is not apparent. Although continuous in point of time with the earlier roll, it does not seem to have been used in the same way as the basis of a portion of the eyre rolls. There are several entries on the eyre rolls, to which there are no corresponding entries on the roll of inquisitions, and the entries which correspond with one another on the two records are not in the same order. Moreover, there are facts stated in the eyre rolls of which we find nothing in the roll of inquisitions. Thus, on the eyre rolls it is stated[2] that two malefactors on 4 October 1251 took a certain Robert of Wick, the hunter of the justice of the forest, bound him to an oak and afterwards permitted him to depart. In the roll of inquisitions[3] it is merely stated that two malefactors took Robert of Wick, when he was standing at his post, and say nothing further about binding him to a tree or permitting him to depart. This may be a small variation, which admits of explanation, but the same cannot be said of the inconsistent statements in the last entry on the eyre rolls and the last entry on the roll of inquisitions, both of which clearly are intended to refer to the same events. It should be noticed also that there is a difference in arrangement between this roll of inquisitions and the earlier roll which we have already described. In the earlier roll, the entries[4] relating to the venison taken by the king's writ and the venison taken without warrant come after the inquisitions and memoranda; while in the latter roll they occur among the inquisitions and memoranda in chronological order.

It would seem, then, that some other roll of special inquisitions extending over the years 35 to 39 Henry III., which no longer exists, was used as a basis for part of the Northampton eyre rolls of 1255. Nevertheless, many of the inquisitions recorded on the roll which we possess probably differ but little in substance from those which were recorded on the roll which was actually used.

Perhaps the most interesting feature of the roll which has survived is an inquisition[5] which was held before Sir Arnold de Bois, the justice of the forest, on 2 October 1253. This is not a special inquisition such as are the others on the same roll. It is described as having been made concerning evil doers in the forest by thirteen jurors and five townships. Nor was it made about a particular trespass by particular evil doers. Probably it was an exceptional inquiry made in consequence of some alleged misconduct on the part of the foresters

[1] See pp. 93 to 116 below.
[2] See p. 32 below.
[3] See p. 99 below.
[4] See pp. 91, 92 below.
[5] See p. 108 below.

and verderers, for all the evil doers seem to have been forest officers or their servants, and the verderers and foresters are not mentioned as having taken part in the proceedings. The inquisition itself is imperfectly recorded. After a series of statements made by the jurors, there comes another list[1] of thirteen jurors, who make further statements, two[2] of which are to the same effect as others already made by the first jurors. There are no introductory or marginal words which explain the object of the second jury, but it is possible that some words have been carelessly omitted and that the enrolment really represents two separate inquisitions held before Sir Arnold de Bois.

On the same roll there is another inquisition[3] which deserves notice. It was made before the justice of the forest on 20 January 125$\frac{3}{4}$ by the foresters and verderers, who made four statements, the first two relate to particular trespasses, the third amplifies the second, and the fourth declares that two persons are evil doers to the venison. This inquisition was of a different character from the one held on 2 October 1253. It was made by the foresters and verderers and not by thirteen jurors; and it was concerned with matters which would usually form the subject of special inquisitions. It bears a close resemblance to the general inquisitions[4] which came into use some thirty years later.

There is an entry[5] on the Northampton eyre roll of 1255, which seems to refer to some inquisitions similar to the one held before Sir Arnold de Bois on 25 October 1253. It occurs among the pleas of the venison, but its introductory words are not the usual 'it is presented etc.,' but 'because it was found and enrolled in the roll of inquisitions which Arnold de Bois, the justice of the forest, made in the bailiwick of Stanion.' The facts which were there found and enrolled do not occur in the roll of the inquisitions 34 to 39 Henry III., which we possess; but as they refer to offences committed by Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, the explanation of their absence may be, that the roll belonged to him and he refused to enrol any matters reflecting upon himself.

There are also entries on the eyre rolls corresponding to the inquisition held before Arnold de Bois on 20 January 125$\frac{3}{4}$, but they are ordinary presentments occurring among the pleas of the venison. The entries which correspond to the first and last of the findings[6] of

[1] See p. 110 below.

[2] Namely, the statements as to Simon the son of Roger of Geddington on pp. 109 and 110; and as to Walter Kakilberd on pp. 110 and 111.

[3] See p. 112 below.

[4] See pp. xlii to l above.

[5] See p. 37 below.

[6] Namely, the entries relating to Walter and Nicholas the sons of Sweyn and

the verderers and foresters at this inquisition are separate presentments[1] among the pleas relating to the forest of Rockingham, but the entry which corresponds to the second finding, and the third, which is supplementary to the second, should be looked for among the pleas of the venison of the forest of Cliffe, relating as it does to evil doers in the bailiwick of Morehay, which lies in that forest.[2]

V.

THE REGARD.

Once in every three years an inspection of the woods within the metes and bounds of the forests was or ought to have been made by twelve knights chosen for the purpose. The inspection was called by the author of the 'Dialogus de Scaccario' the 'uisitatio[3] nemorum,' but it was commonly, even in the twelfth century, known as the Regard. The duty of the twelve knights who were called regarders[4] was to find answers to a set of interrogatories entituled the Chapters of the Regard. Although they appear to have varied in form from time to time during the reigns of Henry II., Richard I., and John, they acquired a rigid form early in the reign of Henry III., which they retained throughout the reigns of the three kings who succeeded him. At least three versions[5] of the Chapters have survived

Walter the son of Robert Perchead on p. 112 below.

[1] See p. 36 below. It should be noticed that on the eyre roll the sons of Sweyn are called Walter and Nicholas; and that nothing is said on it of Ralph Iuelheryng, who is mentioned in the inquisition.

[2] See also p. lxxxix below.

[3] 'Uisitatione nemorum, quam reguardam uulgo dicunt, que tertio anno fit.' (Liber i. cap. xi., Madox, *History and Antiquities of the Exchequer*, ed. 1679, ii. 394.)

On the Pipe Rolls of 21 Hen. ii. we have: 'Idem Radulfus reddit compotum de ciiij *li.* xv *s.* x *d.* de comitatu de Lancastr', ut uisus foreste poneretur in respectu usque ad aliam reguardam.' (*Publications of the Pipe Roll Society*, xxii. 9.)

One of the articles of the forest assize of Ric. i., as given by Roger Howden, is as follows:

'Statutum eciam est quod semper in tercio anno fiat uisus foreste, id est regwardum foreste.' (*Chronica Rogeri de Houeden*, Rolls Series, iv. 65.)

[4] In the twelfth century the regarders were sometimes called 'viewers.' Thus a charter of Richard i. to the bishop of Worcester granted in September 1189 is addressed 'iusticiis, uicecomitibus et forestariis et omnibus ministris et balliuis et uisoribus forestarum.' (Charter Roll 130, m. 12, Entry 48.)

Another charter granted to the canons of Merton by the same king in the same month is addressed 'omnibus iusticiis et uicecomitibus ministris et forestariis suis et uisoribus forestarum de Sudereia.' (Chanc. Carte Antiq., RR. or 49, Entry 10.)

[5] There are also two manuscript versions of the Chapters at the Public Record Office, which appear to belong to the reign of John. They bear a close resemblance to the Chapters in the Chartulary of the Priory of Worcester. The reference to one of them is *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 250, and to the other *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 249, *Roll* 22.

to our time. One occurs in an appendix[1] to the Chronicle of Roger of Howden, and apparently belongs to the closing years of the reign of Henry II. There is another in the Chartulary[2] of the Priory of Worcester, which, although not dated, is evidently of an earlier date than the Charter of the Forest of November 1217, and probably was issued at the time of the forest eyre in 10 John. The third, which became rigid, is endorsed for the first time on the Patent Roll[3] of 13 Henry III., and again on many of the Close Rolls of subsequent years.

One of the articles[4] of the Charter of the Forest provides that the regarders are to go through the forests to make the regard just as it was wont to be made at the time of the first coronation of King Henry II. and not otherwise. Another article[5] provides that the inquisition or view of lawing of dogs in the forest should be made in future when the regard ought to be made, namely from third year to third year. We have no means of knowing whether the regards were made with regularity[6] every third year, but the procedure, as far as we know it, was as follows. Before the king issued a commission in eyre he sent a writ[7] to the sheriff, ordering him to cause a regard to be made before the coming of the justices; and in the usual writ, which was sent to the sheriff ordering him to summon all who ought to come before the justices in eyre, there was a direction that he should cause the regarders to come with the regards. In the eyre rolls all the regards since the last eyre were recorded; but they were not enrolled each one by itself. All the regards were incorporated in the one, which was made pursuant to the king's writ, in such a way that it read as if there had been one regard only since the last eyre.

The Chapters of the Regard[8] which appear on the back of the Patent Roll of 13 Henry III. are twelve in number. One of them is

[1] *Chronica Rogeri de Houeden*, Rolls Series, ii. 243.

[2] *Registrum Prioratus B. M. Wigorniensis*, Works of the Camden Society, vol. 91, p. 96, a.

[3] Patent Roll 37, m. 9 *in dorso*.

[4] 'Reguardores nostri eant per forestas ad faciendum reguardum sicut fieri consueuit tempore prime coronacionis predicti regis Henrici aui nostri et non aliter.'

[5] 'Inquisicio uel uisus de expeditacione canum existencium in foresta, decetero fiat, quando debet fieri reguardum, scilicet, de tercio anno in tercium annum; et tunc fiat per uisum et testimonium legalium hominum et non aliter.'

[6] A few original regards exist. Among the most interesting are three which were presented to the justices in eyre at Northampton in 1256. The reference to them is *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., Nos.* 64, 66, 67.

[7] The writ to the sheriff of Rutland dated 21 Feb. 1229, ordering him to summon all the foresters and regarders of his bailiwick to make a regard, is printed in *Royal Letters, Hen. iii.*, Rolls Series, i. 345.

[8] They are printed in *Royal Letters, Hen. iii.*, Rolls Series, i. 346.

concerned with the herbage in the king's demesnes, another with eyries of hawks and falcons in the forest, a third with forges and mines, a fourth with harbours from which timber could be exported, and a fifth with honey in the forest. To these five chapters there are often no-answers recorded in the regards enrolled upon the eyre rolls. In most of the forests there were no seaports; and in many of them there were neither forges nor mines. If the king's demesnes were well kept, and if his rights with respect to the eyries of hawks and falcons and to honey in the forest had not been infringed, there would in general be no need for any enrolment about these matters.

The chapters which were considered to be of real importance related to assarts, purprestures and waste, offences which yielded a considerable revenue at every eyre. Each chapter contained several questions. The first one was as follows:

The assarts made in the forest after the beginning of the second year of the first coronation of Henry III. are to be viewed, and to be estimated by the number of acres. And it is to be inquired who made them, and who now holds them; and with what corn they have been sown. And if they shall not now be sown it is to be inquired with what corn they were sown after the beginning of the second year of the first coronation of the aforesaid king or after the last regard made after the aforesaid time. And the sowing of the winter corn [1] is to be written by itself, and the sowing of the spring corn by itself. And it is to be inquired of whose fee they are; and to what town they belong. And the assarts which were made before the last regard made after the beginning of the second year of the coronation of the aforesaid king are to be written by themselves; and those which were made afterwards by themselves.

Two series of questions relating to purprestures of different kinds, and another relating to wastes, were chapters of the regard closely resembling in form the chapter relating to assarts. Of the three remaining chapters one directed a view to be made of the king's demesne woods, and an inquiry whether the underwood and branches in them had been impaired. Another ordered that all purprestures, assarts and wastes in the king's demesnes should be viewed and inbreviated in the same manner as before the Charter of the Forest. The last declared that the regarders were to inquire who had bows or arrows, crossbows, braches or greyhounds, or anything else for doing harm to the king's deer.

But instead of enrolling the answers of the regarders one by one

[1] The words 'winter corn' are here used to represent the Latin 'hibernagium' and 'spring corn' to represent the Latin 'tramesium.'

and chapter by chapter, the clerk of the justices usually drew up an abstract of those relating to assarts, purprestures and wastes divided into six paragraphs which between them contained all the information required. The paragraphs were entituled respectively, the old assarts, the new assarts, the old purprestures, the new purprestures, the old wastes, and the new wastes. And each paragraph contained a series of formal entries, each of which related to a particular assart, purpresture, or act of waste.

In the 'Dialogus de Scaccario' essarts[1] are explained as follows:

> Essarta uero uulgo dicuntur que apud Isidorum occationes nominantur; quando scilicet foreste nemora uel dumeta quelibet pascuis et latibulis opportuna succiduntur; quibus succisis et radicibus auulsis, terra subuertitur et excolitur.

The word seems always to have implied the uprooting of trees and the reduction of the land on which they stood to cultivation. An assart might be made either in the covert or in a wood outside the covert but within the metes and bounds of the forest. The punishment for a trespass of this nature was an amercement at the next forest eyre; but the person who held the assart was also obliged to pay a further sum for the crops sown upon it, which was assessed as follows. For every acre of land the payment was a shilling for every crop of winter corn, and sixpence for every crop of spring corn.[2] Usually the same piece of land seems to have been sown alternately with winter and spring corn, and to have remained fallow for a year after a certain number of crops had been sown. The record seldom states the nature of the corn sown in the winter; but it occasionally states that an assart has been sown with wheat or rye.[3] In such cases the tenant accounted for the crop as if it had been sown in the winter. On the other hand, the tenant is frequently stated to have sown his assart with oats,[4] and as he is always charged with a

[1] Liber i. cap. xiii., printed in Madox, *History and Antiquities of the Exchequer*, ed. 1769, vol. i. p. 396.

[2] See p. lxxvii, note, above.

[3] There are very few instances of rye (*siligo*) being expressly mentioned in the record of a regard. Some instances occur in the regard recorded on the Staffordshire eyre rolls of September 1271. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 184.) Instances of wheat being expressly mentioned frequently occur.

[4] Oats are the only crops expressly mentioned in the regards, for which the tenants accounted at the rate of sixpence an acre. Barley is never mentioned. If it was sown at all in assarts, it was probably included in the general word 'tramesium' or 'trameys.'

In the Forest Assize of Rich. i., as stated by Roger of Howden, the following article occurs:

'In rewardo, autem, foreste hec supradicta uidenda sunt. Et uidenda sunt in rewardo noua essarta et uetera inbladata post ultimum rewardum et quo blado uel legumine inbladata sint. Noua, autem, sarta erunt in manu regis; si uetera sarta inbladata sunt de frumento uel siligine, unaqueque acra dabit regi duodecim denarios de illa uestitura; et si inbladata

payment of sixpence for each such crop, it may be inferred that oats were sown in the spring.

The entry recording an assart on the eyre rolls usually specifies, as directed by the Chapters of the Regard, the name of the lord to whose fee the assart belongs. By the lord of the fee is meant the person of whom the tenant of the assart ought to hold.[1] Information on this point would always be useful in identifying the property. Moreover, as a lord must in general have been a consenting party to the assarting and sowing of his tenant, it was desirable that the justices should have his name in order that they might render him responsible if his tenant made default. The following are entries[2] relating to the new assarts.

De nouis assartis.

Willelmus filius Warini assartauit de nouo apud Abbelynch dimidiam acram de solo proprio et in bosco suo sine waranto. Et mortuus est. Terra capiatur. Et fuit inbladata bis de iuernagio et semel de tremesio; unde Eua la Walech', que modo tenet eandem terram respondebit nomine custodis; et de quindecim denariis.

Willelmus Rocholf assartauit de nouo apud Scherchelench' octauam partem unius acre de feodo Willelmi de Bello Campo sine waranto; ideo in misericordia. Terra capiatur. Et non fuit inbladata.

Rogerus de la Holte de Stodleye assartauit unum curtilagium ad latitudinem duarum perticarum et ad longitudinem trium perticarum; clausatum de fossato et bassa haya; ideo in misericordia. Terra capiatur et clausum prosternatur. Non inbladata.

Thomas filius Roberti assartauit de nouo duas rodas ibidem. Et fuit imbladata semel de iuernagio et semel de trameys; ideo in misericordia. Terra capiatur et clausum prosternatur; nouem denarii.

The tenant of an assart was usually allowed to retain it subject to his accounting for the crops at each eyre of the justices of the forest. Thus the new assarts of one eyre became old assarts at the next and subsequent eyres. Entries of the old assarts on the eyre rolls were in the following form:[3]

fuerint de auena uel hordeo uel fabis uel pisis uel alio legumine unaqueque acra dabit regi sex denarios de illa uestitura.' (*Chronica Rogeri de Houeden*, Rolls Series, vol. iv. p. 65.)

[1] It seems that the king claimed that assarts should be held of him and not of a mesne lord. One of the articles of the barons' petition of 1258 was as follows:

'Item petunt [remedium] de assartis factis infra metas foreste de terris suis propriis et tenementorum suorum [*sic*] de nouo arentatis, unde dominus rex uendicat sibi custodiam heredum talium et nihilominus uendicat seruitium omne inde debitum.' (*Annales Monastici*, *Burton*, Rolls Series, i. 440.)

[2] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 231, *Roll* 8.

[3] Ibid. *Roll* 7.

De ueteribus assartis.

Elias de Stanes tenet dimidiam acram ueteris assarti inbladatam ter de iuernagio et ter de tremesio .	ij s	iij d
De Willelmo Corbet pro una acra ueteris assarti in Schaldesle ut prius	iiij s	vj d
De Isabella de Bosco pro dimidia acra ueteris assarti ibidem eodem modo inbladata	ij s	iij d
De Roberto le Prouost de Chadesle pro uicesima parte unius acre ibidem eodem modo inbladata . .		ij d ob
De Willelmo Dobes pro inbladacione dimidie acre apud Cutbaldesheye inbladate ut prius	ij s	iij d

Purprestures are thus explained by the author of 'Dialogus de Scaccario'[1]:

Fit interdum per negligentiam uicecomitis uel eius ministrorum, uel etiam per continuatam in longa tempora bellicam tempestatem, ut habitantes prope fundos qui corone annominantur aliquam eorum portionem sibi usurpent et suis possessionibus ascribant. Cum autem perlustrantes iudices per sacramentum legitimorum uirorum hec deprehenderint seorsum a firma comitatus appretiantur et uicecomitibus traduntur ut de eisdem seorsum respondeant; et hec dicimus purpresturas uel occupata; que quidem cum deprehenduntur, a possessoribus sicut predictum est tolluntur et abhinc fisco cedunt. Uerum si is a quo tollitur occupatum auctor est facti, simul etiam nisi rex ei pepercerit, pecuniariter grauissime punietur; quod si non auctor sed heres auctoris fuerit, ad penam sufficit fundi eiusdem sola reuocatio. Ex quo sane, sicut ex aliis pluribus, regis misericordia comprobatur; dum patris tam enormis excessus non punitur in filio, qui usque ad factam inquisitionem publice potestatis iactura ditabitur.

In this passage it is clear that the word purpresture meant an encroachment on the king's demesnes by the unlawful occupation of land; but in the forest law it was used to signify an encroachment of any sort upon the forest. Thus, it was a purpresture to enlarge a curtilage in the forest, even though the land appropriated was not part of the king's demesne; or to erect a mill or make a fishpond within the covert. So, too, it was a purpresture if a tenant of lands within a forest enclosed any part of them with a hedge and ditch without the king's licence. In these cases the offender was amerced in the forest eyre, and an order was given that the enclosing hedge and ditch should be removed. It frequently happened, however, that the justices in eyre allowed the land to remain enclosed, on payment

[1] Lib. i. cap. x. Madox, *History and Antiquities of the Exchequer*, vol. ii. p. 424.

of a small sum of money in addition to the amercement. The following are examples[1] of the enrolment of new purprestures on the forest eyre rolls.

De nouis purpresturis.

Willelmus de Berdeley ampliauit clausum suum apud Barndeleye de decem perticatis in longitudine et decem pedibus[2] in latitudine. Et clausit paruo fossato et bassa haya sine waranto; ideo in misericordia. Clausa prosternatur etc. De feodo Henrici de Sturmy. Idem dat pro misericordia et pro clausa ut possit stare duos solidos.

Willelmus de Purshull' ampliauit cortilagium suum apud Rossehok' de quatuor perticatis in longitudine et de sex pedibus in latitudine. Et clausit ut prius sine waranto. Ideo etc. Clausa prosternatur. Idem dat pro misericordia et pro clausa ut possit stare duodecim denarios.

Any enclosure of arable land by means of a hedge and a ditch, although outside the covert of the forest, was reckoned a purpresture, notwithstanding the fact that the Charter of the Forest permitted[3] every free man 'to make arable outside the covert in arable land.' In all such cases the offender was amerced at the forest eyre. It should be noticed that a man might be liable for an assart and a purpresture with respect to the same piece of land. He might cut down a parcel of wood, reduce it to cultivation, and then enclose it with a hedge and a ditch. In this case there would be a single entry recording the facts on the eyre rolls, which might be found either among the New Purprestures or the New Assarts.

[1] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 231, *Roll* 7.

[2] MS. pedes.

[3] The text of the provision in the Charter of the Forest is printed on p. lxxxii below. It is not quite clear what the clause about arable land was intended to signify. The following is an article of the Chapters of Regard which relates to the subject of arable land in arable land:

'Item uidende sunt omnes purpresture de terra arabili extra coopertum foreste in terra arabili, facte post confeccionem carte domini regis de libertatibus foreste, et estimande per numerum acrarum et uidendum quo blado modo imbladate fuerint; et si modo imbladate non fuerint, inquirendum quo blado imbladate fuerint post tempus predictum, et quis eas tenet et ad quam uillam pertineant et scribantur per se.'

The following entry on the rolls of the Cumberland eyre of 13 Ed. i. supplies an example of the provision of the Charter of the Forest on this subject being set up as a defence:

'Presentatum fuit per regardatores . . . quod T. prior de W. fecerat unam purpresturam de sex acris terre et una acra prat apud W.

'Qui predicti iuratores dicunt ad primam purpresturam de sex acris terre et una acra prati, quod non sunt ibi nisi una acra et dimidia terre per amensuracionem et quod est infra Akergarth et est terra arabilis in terra arabili; et quod idem prior de eo in nullo deliquit, quia bene licitum est sibi redigere terram arabilem in terra arabili infra Akergarth prout continetur in carta foreste de libertatibus foreste. Et ideo omnes regardatores . . . pro sua falsa presentacione in misericordia. Et ipse prior inde quietus et ipsam acram et dimidiam habeat et teneat imperpetuum.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 5, *Roll* 36 *d.*)

The following are some further examples of entries of New Purprestures :

De nouis purpresturis.[1]

Ricardus Carettarius fecit quandam purpresturam apud Samburne de nouo de feodo abbatis de Euesham ; et clausit fossato et haya sine waranto. Ideo in misericordia. Clausum prosternatur.

Robertus de Mep occupauit de nouo apud Ippele dimidiam acram de feodo Henrici Hubaud ; et clausit fossato et haya sine waranto. Et mortuus est. Alicia uxor eius modo tenet. Clausum prosternatur.

Ricardus de la Rudynge occupauit apud Hamme unam perticatam terre in longitudine et tantum in latitudine de solo domini regis ; et clausit haya sine waranto ; ideo in misericordia. Terra capiatur. Clausum prosternatur.

Nicholaus filius Theobaldi de Pyrie occupauit unam acram apud Pyrie de feodo eiusdem Theobaldi. Et non clausit ideo quietus et teneat eodem modo.

Symon Aleyn occupauit unam perticatam terre apud Oddyngele et clausit fossato et haya sine waranto ; ideo in misericordia. Clausum prosternatur. Et conceditur ei ut domus et clausum stent.

Where there was a purpresture by unlawful cultivation, the trespasser was usually permitted to continue cultivating his land subject to his accounting for the crops as in the case of assarts. Thus the old purprestures of one eyre were the new purprestures of some previous eyre. The entries recording the old purprestures on the eyre rolls were in the same form as those recording the old assarts—thus [2] :

De ueteribus purpresturis.

De Iohanne de Borstall' et Mauricio de Bynthon' pro inbladatura decem acrarum ueteris purpresture de solo regis in Brymesgraue. Inbladatur ter de iuernagio et ter de auena . . . . . xlv s.

De Iohanne de Stupelleye, Willelmo de la Lynde et Iohanne de la Lynde pro inbladacione dimidie acre ibidem inbladate ut prius . . . . ij s. iij d.

De Roberto de la Brok', Iohanne Gerueys et Iohanne Cade pro inbladacione decem acrarum ibidem eodem modo inbladatarum . . . . xlv s.

De Willelmo filio Willelmi, Thoma de Burnesforde, Iohanne de Scherleford et Nicholao filio Oseberti pro inbladacione decem acrarum ibidem eodem modo inbladatarum . . . . xlv s.

An alteration in the law relating to purprestures was made by the Charter of the Forest, the twelfth chapter of which was as follows:

Unusquisque liber homo decetero sine occasione faciat in bosco suo uel in terra sua, quam habeat in foresta, molendinum uiuarium stagnum

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 231, *Roll* 8 *d.* [2] Ibid. *No.* 231, *Roll* 7.

marleram fossatum uel terram arabilem extra cooperatum in terra arabili ita quod non sit ad nocumentum alicuius uicini.

Thus, certain acts, such as the erection of a mill, which had hitherto been accounted purprestures, in whatever part of the forest they were committed, could henceforth be committed with impunity outside the covert by the owner of a land or woods within the forest. If, however, the owner or anyone else enclosed the land with a hedge and ditch, he was guilty of a purpresture, notwithstanding the Charter of the Forest.

Tenants of woods within the forest had the right of cutting wood for fuel and the repair of their property. The precise extent of the right and the mode in which it was exercised probably varied in different forests. It is probable that in some forests they were allowed to lop trees, subject to the supervision of the forest officers, while in others they were allowed to take underwood and even fully-grown trees other than oaks. But whatever the nature of the right was, any abuse of it was recorded by the regarders in their rolls as waste. In the eyre rolls the entries relating to wastes made since the last eyre are styled 'The New Wastes,' and form one of the chief features of the enrolment of the regard. They vary in form, but the following are specimen entries [1] :

De nouis uastis boscorum.

Boscus Felicie de Radeford' de Lenche Randholf, quem ipsa tenet nomine dotis, uastatur de ueteri, et iterum de nouo per eandem; ideo ipsa in misericordia. Boscus capiatur in manum domini regis. De eadem Felicia pro misericordia et quod rehabeat boscum suum dimidia marca.

Boscus Willelmi de Bello Campo de Alencestere uastatur de ueteri, et iterum omnino deuastatur per eundem Walterum de nouo, et per Robertum le Loue, qui fuit seruiens eiusdem Walteri apud Alencestr', et per Rogerum Careman et Willelmum Daybond, qui fuerunt wodewardi eiusdem bosci per eorum uendiciones et dona; et ipsi wodewardi dederunt unam carettatam busce pro duabus carettatis extraendis; ideo idem ipsi in misericordia et bosci capiantur in manum domini regis. De predicto Waltero pro misericordia quinque marce.

Et abbas Alecestr' uenit et clamat habere estoueria sua in eodem bosco, uidelicet, unam carettatam busce [2] uno equo. Et ostendit cartas regis Henrici de confirmacione et dominorum feodi qui fuerunt antiquitus de donacione. Ideo consideratum est et preceptum quod forestarii domini regis faciant ipsi abbati liberatam in eodem bosco de cetero in forma predicta.

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 231, *Roll* 8 *d.*

[2] MS. 'bosce.'

Boscus Henrici Hubaud apud Ippele uastatur de ueteri et iterum de nouo per eundem ; ideo ipse in misericordia et boscus capiatur. Postea uenit dictus Henricus et finiuit tam pro misericordia quam pro bosco suo rehabendo ; uiginti solidos ; plegii Simon Leuelaunse et Nicholaus Nel.

When the owner of a wood which he had wasted had made fine for his amercement and for having his wood again, he was still bound to pay half a mark at every forest eyre until the wood had grown into its former state. These payments occur in the record of every regard on the eyre rolls, thus [1] :

De uastis boscorum de ueteri.

De Willelmo de Bello Campo comite War' pro ueteri uasto bosci sui de Abbelynch' . . . . dimidia marca.

De sacrista de Euesham pro ueteri uasto bosci de Attelench . . . . dimidia marca.

De Waltero de Kocesey pro ueteri uasto bosci de Lench Randolf . . . . dimidia marca.

When the wood has grown to the state in which it was before it wasted the entry on the eyre rolls is usually similar to the following [2] :

Boscus Ricardi de Portesye apud Portes' uastatur de ueteri. Postea protestatum est per uiridarios forestarios [et] regardatores quod boscus predictus bene reuenit ; ideo idem Ricardus dat domino regi dimidiam marcam pro eodem bosco, ne de cetero presentetur in uetus uastum. Et hoc regardatoribus preceptum est.

As already stated, some of the answers which were given by the regarders were often not recorded upon the eyre rolls. Besides the six paragraphs relating to assarts, purprestures and wastes, the only answer which was usually recorded upon them was a list of persons having greyhounds within the forest. A few records, however, of the original regards presented to the justices in eyre have survived from which we may learn the manner in which all the chapters were answered by the regarders. The original record [3] of the three regards made in the forests of Cliffe and Rockingham in the years 34, 37 and 39 Henry III. respectively is among the most interesting of those which have survived. It proves that the regarders were not bound to frame their answers in strict accordance with the words of the chapters. The fifth chapter [4] was as follows :

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 231, *Roll* 9.
[2] Ibid. *No.* 158, *Roll* 17.
[3] Ibid. *No.* 67.
[4] *Royal Letters, Hen. iii.*, Rolls Series, i. 347.

Et uidendi sunt dominici bosci domini regis et quilibet ceppus de quercu et de fago factus post principium secundi anni prime coronacionis predicti regis Henrici siue post ultimum regardum, si quod postea factum fuerit, debet diligenter nominari et per se scribi et inquirendum utrum bosci deteriorati fuerint de subbosco uel exbrancatura et deterioratio subbosci et exbrancatura scribatur per se.

The answer[1] of the regarders to this chapter is recorded thus :

Cippi quercuum ; anno regni regis Henrici xxxiiij.

Uidendi sunt omnes dominici bosci, et quilibet ceppus etc. Numerus cepporum inuentorum in dominicis boscis domini regis tempore W. de Norhamp'.

In bosco de firma de Clyue inuenti fuerunt xxxvij ceppi.
In parco de Cliue inuenti fuerunt lviij ceppi.
In Morhey inuenti fuerunt xv ceppi.
In bosco de Dudigton' xj ceppi.
In parco de Bricstoke inuenti fuerunt xliij ceppi.
In Bulax et Exhawe inuenti fuerunt xix ceppi bletron'.
Item in eisdem boscis inuenti fuerunt lx ceppi.

In secundo reuardo de ceppis ; anno regni regis Henrici xxxvij.

Dicunt quod inuenti fuerunt sexies-uiginti et v ceppi per totam balliuam de Clyue in dominicis boscis domini regis.

Item dicunt quod inuenti fuerunt in baliua de Brikestoke, scilicet in parco et in bosco de Geytingtun' quinquies-uiginti ceppi.

In tercio reuardo de ceppis ; anno regni Henrici xxxix.

Dicunt quod inuenti fuerunt in parco de la Clyue octies-uiginti et xij ceppi.

In bosco de Firma de Cliue inuenti fuerunt xxxvij ceppi.
In bosco de Syuele inuenti fuerunt quinquies-uiginti et xix ceppi.
In bosco Vesthey inuenti fuerunt lx ceppi.
In bosco de Morhey lix ceppi.
In bosco de Tothou xx ceppi.
In parco de Bricstoke et in bosco de Geytintun' inuenti fuerunt ccc et vij ceppi.
In bosco de Firma inuenti fuerunt clvj ceppi.

It will be seen that the regarders ignored a portion of the fifth chapter and only answered the remainder of it in a very inadequate fashion. In the second regard they do not even state how many

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 67, *m.* 7.

'ceppi' or stumps were found in the different demesne woods of the forest; they merely record the total number found in the two bailiwicks in which the demesne woods were situate. The record of the regards continues briefly as follows:

Item uidende sunt dominice haye domini regis. Dicunt quod nichil sciunt; sed bene custodiuntur.

Item dicunt quod de purpresturis nec assartis factis in dominicis domini regis nichil sciunt.

Item uidende sunt omnes aerie austurcorum speruariorum et falconum etc. Dicunt quod nichil sciunt.[1]

Item uidendi sunt portus quibus applicant naues etc. Dicunt quod nichil sciunt.

Item uidendum est mel etc. Dicunt quod I. de H. in Stanerne exarsit in altitudine septem pedum unam quercum in dominico bosco domini regis pro melle inuento.

Item milites debent attente inquirere etc. Dicunt quod H. de E. habet leporarios [2] brachettos ad leporem wlpem et catum capiendum.

Item dicunt quod W. de B. habet leporarios [2] brachettos ad idem.

Nine entries similar to the last of the above conclude the original record of this regard. Although it contains answers to several chapters which, as a rule, are not recorded upon the forest eyre rolls, it contains no answer to the chapter which was concerned with forges and mines. Moreover, to three of the chapters the regarders merely answer that they know nothing. This was no doubt the answer which was usually given to most of the chapters other than those which asked for information about assarts, purprestures and wastes, and greyhounds kept within the metes of the forest. When all the information which the regarders could give was that they knew nothing, there was obviously no need for an entry on the forest eyre rolls, for no profit to the king could arise from such an answer.

In the thirteenth century the regarders appear to have had no duties to perform except to make the regard; but by the 'Ordinacio [3] Foreste' of 1301, they were required to attend the general inquisitions or swanimotes together with the foresters, verderers and agisters. They were chosen by the sheriff on receipt of the writ which directed a regard to be made shortly before the forest eyre. In the intervals between the eyres, there were no elections of regarders, but at the forest inquisitions held after the 'Ordinacio [3] Foreste,' any deficiency

[1] It is not improbable that the answers to this chapter were sometimes incorporated in the paragraphs 'De Nouis Purpresturis' and 'De Ueteribus Purpresturis' which are recorded upon the eyre rolls.

[2] It is probable that the word 'et' is omitted here.

[3] *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 147.

in their number was supplied by persons who were appointed regarders for a day only.

No salary attached to the office of a regarder, but it is probable that the expenses of the regard fell upon the inhabitants of the forest. In an inquisition held at Farnham in 42 Edward III.[1] the jurors make the following declaration :

Item dicunt quod abbas de Wauerle a tempore sine memoria tenetur inuenire apud Dakkenfeld' forestariis et regardatoribus domini regis in regardo faciendo unum repastum, herbergagium [2] per unam noctem, fenum et auenas pro equis eorum.

VI.

THE CLERGY

There was a special procedure for clerks [3] accused of felonies in the King's court differing from that which obtained in the case of laymen similarly accused. So, too, there was a special procedure for clerks accused of trespasses in the forests. Henry II., it is true, evidently desired to have a uniform procedure for poachers whether clerks or laymen ; although in this respect his policy was ultimately unsuccessful. As early as the year 1176 we find him writing [4] to the pope, Alexander III., declaring that he had made certain concessions to the papal legate. The first of these was as follows :

Uidelicet quod clericus de cetero non trahatur ante iudicem secularem in persona sua de aliquo criminali, neque de aliquo forisfacto, excepto forisfacto foreste mee, et excepto laico feodo unde michi vel alii domino seculari laicum debetur seruitium.

Again, the assize of Woodstock, which, according to Dr. Stubbs, was issued in 1184, contained this provision : [5]

Item rex defendit quod nullus clericus ei forisfaciat de uenacione sua nec de forestis suis ; precepit bene forestariis suis quod si inuenerint eos forisfacientes, non dubitent in eos manum ponere, ad eos retinendum et attachiandum ; et ipse eos bene warantizabit.

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, 310, *Skin* 18.

[2] MS. 'herbigagium.'

[3] For the status of the clergy in the thirteenth century see Pollock and Maitland, *History of English Law*, ed. 1898, vol. i. pp. 439-457.

[4] *Radulfi de Diceto Opera Historica*, Rolls Series, i. 410.

[5] The text of this provision is taken from *Gesta Henrici*, Rolls Series, vol. ii. p. clxiii.

Thus it is clear that he wished clerks to be impleaded in his own courts for offences against the forest law, although he was willing that they should not be impleaded there for other offences. He wished, also, that the privileges of the clergy should not prevent the foresters from attaching and arresting them for trespasses against the venison.

We shall probably never have sufficient material to enable us to learn in detail what was the procedure in the case of poaching clerks in the reigns of Henry II., and his sons Richard I. and John.[1] In the reign of Henry III., however, we can learn the greater part of the procedure from the rolls of the forest eyre. If a clerk and a layman, both accused of trespass, failed to make an appearance at the forest eyre, the justices would direct the sheriff to cause the layman and the bishop to cause the clerk to come respectively. This is evident from the following[2] and many other examples.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Galfridus filius Roberti de Sutorp, magister Willelmus persona de Bernak', Gilebertus de Dunstal, Robertus persona de Pokebroc, Gilebertus de Bernak', Iohannes Faunel et Iohannes Syrey sunt malefactores uenacionis. Et Gilebertus de Bernak' uenit et detentus est in prisona. Et Galfridus filius Roberti, persona de Bernak' et Gilebertus de Dunstal, persona de Pokebroc', Iohannes Faunel et Iohannes Syry non ueniunt ; ideo preceptum est uicecomiti etc. quod etc. dictos laicos Et mandatum est episcopo Linc' quod venire faciat Robertum personam de Pokebroc' et Willelmum personam de Bernak etc.

If, however, the bishop returned no answer to the mandate of the justices, they would direct that the defaulting clerk should be exacted in the county court. Thus:

Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum quod dominica proxima post festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno tricesimo quinto magister Iohannes de Brudeport transiens per forestam uersus Lacok' inuenit quandam bestiam captam per quendam leporarium album, cuius bestie medietatem secum asportauit sine waranto; et modo non uenit nec fuit attachiatus; ideo mandatum est episcopo Sarr' quod faciat eum uenire etc. a die sancte Trinitatis in quindecim dies. Ad diem non uenit nec episcopus aliquid retornat; ideo dictus Iohannes exigatur et utlagetur.[3]

[1] The following letters patent of 7 June 1200 should be noticed :

'Iohannes dei gracia etc. iusticiariis uicecomitibus etc. Sciatis nos concessisse uenerabili patri nostro H. Cant' archiepiscopo custodiam omnium clericorum captiuorum pro quocunque forisfacto fuerint capti uel detenti. Unde uobis firmiter precipimus quod eidem archiepiscopo reddatis omnes clericos quos in custodia uestra habetis, si quos in custodia habeatis, uel quos uos pro aliquo forisfacto quodcunque sit contigerit habere. Et prohibemus ne quis aliquem clericum pro quocunque forisfacto detinere presumat postquam prefatus archiepiscopus ipsum requisierit. Testibus Willelmo Maresc' comite de Penbroc etc. apud Argent' septimo die Iunii.' (*Rotuli Chartarum*, p. 68.)

[2] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 68, *Roll* 2.

[3] Ibid. *No.* 198, *Roll* 6.

If on the other hand the clerk duly appeared in court the justices would proceed with his case just as if he were a layman; and would sentence him to prison. But if the bishop then claimed him as a clerk, the justices would surrender him as one convicted of an offence against the forest laws. Thus, at the Northampton forest eyre of 1256, two clerks, John the son of John Caperun and William the son of the parson of Thornhaugh were committed to prison. The record [1] of the case continues thus:

Et super hoc uenerunt magistri Walterus decanus Norhamt' et Willelmus de Lindes' atornati episcopi Lync' ad recipiendos clericos a prisona coram iusticiariis, et pecierunt dictum Iohannem filium Iohannis Caperun; et liberatur eisdem tanquam clericus. Et quia uxoratus est et habet laicum feodum, preceptum est uicecomiti quod capiat terram etc.; ita quod manum etc. Et postea uenit Iohannes Caperun et finiuit per quadraginta solidos.

Postea uenerunt magistri Walterus decanus Norhamt' et Willelmus de Lyndes' et pecierunt Willelmum filium persone de Tornhawe, eo quod clericus est; et liberatur eisdem tanquam conuictus et apertus malefactor de uenacione, quia dicti magistri fuerunt atornati episcopi Lync' per litteras patentes ad petendum clericos inprisonatos coram iusticiariis. . . . Et postea uenit Willelmus filius persone de Tornhawe, et finiuit per unam marcam.

The actual form of the letters patent which the bishops used on these occasions is recorded on one of the rolls [2] of the Wiltshire eyre of 1257:

Nouerint uniuersi presentes literas inspecturi quod nos E. dei paciencia Sar' ecclesie minister humilis dilecto filio decano de Wylton' committimus uices nostras quociens nosmetipsos uel officialem nostrum generalem abesse contigerit. Et in huius rei fidem et testimonium presentibus sigillum nostrum duximus apponi. Date apud Bromhal' quindecimo die Iunii anno gracie mcclvij.

But although a clerk might be delivered to the bishop as one convicted of a trespass in the forest, he did not escape punishment. He had to make fine just as if he were a layman. This is evident from the case of William the son of the parson of Thornhaugh, who, although delivered to the attorneys of the bishop of Lincoln, subsequently made fine by a mark. Indeed it frequently happens that the record merely states that the clerk made fine without stating that he had been delivered to the bishop. In such cases either the clerk made fine without waiting to be delivered, or the record is silent about the delivery, because as the fact led to no profit to the king, there

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 68, *Roll* 2. [2] Ibid. *No.* 198, *Roll* 10.

was no need for its enrolment. The case of Robert the parson of Polebrook and William the parson of Barnack, part of which is printed above, supplies an instance of clerks making fine without it being stated on the rolls that they were delivered to the bishop. The enrolment of this case proceeds :

Postea uenit Gilebertus de Bernak' et finem fecit per quadraginta solidos per pleuinam Mauricii de Andeli et Thome de Welham capellani. Postea Willelmus persona de Bernak' taxatur ad uiginti solidos. Et Robertus persona de Pokebroc taxatur ad decem marcas. Et Iohannes Faunel pauper et perdonatur.

In this case it will be observed that the clerks are described as being taxed, and not as making fine. The use of the expression cannot be easily explained. It seems to have been used generally when the clergy had been convicted of a trespass against the venison. But in some cases clerks made fine and in others laymen were taxed.

The forest procedure was evidently considered as very unsatisfactory by the clergy, for in the year 1257, they, having granted to the king a sum of fifty thousand marks, drew up a long list[1] of grievances which contained the two following articles[2] :

Item, cum contingit clericum pro delicto foreste defamari, per inquisicionem uiridariorum et forestariorum super capcione uenacionis uocatur coram iusticiariis ; et licet ab ordinariis repetatur, nisi prius carceri laicali mancipetur, suo ordinario nullatenus liberatur ; et post liberacionem factam episcopo, per inquisicionem factam per laicos pena pecuniara condempnatur.

Item similiter condempnantur absentes et ignorantes ad simplicem uocem uiridariorum et forestariorum cum ad inquisicionem per laicos factam non debeant condempnari clerici uel aliqualiter iudicari, et tam isti quam illi compelluntur soluere merciamenta per possessiones laicales si quas habent. Sin autem, distringuntur episcopi per baronias suas, ut dictos clericos compellant de suis beneficiis soluere condempnacionem.

The meaning of the clause 'nisi prius carceri laicali mancipetur' in the first of these articles is not quite clear, but it seems that the justices refused to deliver an accused clerk to the ordinary unless he had previously been imprisoned by way of process to secure his appearance at the forest eyre. If he had been so imprisoned, the

[1] *Math. Paris. Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, vi. 356, 357.

[2] These articles should be compared with the Merton articles of the year 1258, which include the following :

'Clericus tamen super transgressione foreste coram suo ordinario canonice conuictus, domino regi uel alio damnum et iniuriam passo, per eundem ordinarium satisfacere compellatur ; et alias arbitrio ordinarii sui canonica pena puniatur.' (*Annales Monastici*, *Burton*, Rolls Series, p. 417.)

The Merton articles are also printed in Wat's editions of Mathew Paris, ed. 1640, p. 201, and ed. 1684, p. 1123.

justices would deliver him to the ordinary as a clerk convicted of a trespass against the forest laws. It also appears that the justices refused to allow the pecuniary penalty to be assessed by the bishops in their courts. The punishment of a poaching clerk was considered to be as much a matter for the king as his trial.

The clergy also enjoyed an immunity from the necessity of finding pledges for their appearance at the forest eyre when accused of offences against the venison. Sometimes it is stated in the record that a man was not attached because he was a clerk. Of this we have an example[1] from the Northampton eyre of 1253.

Presentatum est per forestarios et uiridarios quod die[2] Martis proxima post festum sancti Gregorii anno tricesimo octauo quod Willelmus Belayys homo Walteri de Rudham persone de Treng' occidit quendam ceruum in bosco de Blysewurth' quem ceruum idem Walterus habuit. . . . Et Walterus de Rudham non uenit nec fuit attachiatus quia clericus; ideo mandatum est episcopo Linc' quod faciat eum uenire etc.

On the other hand, it seems clear that the clergy were, in fact, liable to arrest, when found in the act of trespassing in the forest, although they did not admit liability. Thus in the year 1251 the foresters of Weybridge arrested[3] a servant of John of Crakehall, who was found trespassing in the forest by night. The vicar of Huntingdon and a servant of the bishop of Lincoln demanded that he should be delivered from prison and restored to Holy Church. They threatened to excommunicate the foresters and then went to the prison and dragged out the offending clerk. At the eyre the vicar was ordered to appear before the justices and was delivered as one convicted of these facts to the archdeacon of Huntingdon, who was probably attending the court as the attorney of the bishop for the purpose of receiving clerks. The servant of John of Crakehall was also delivered to the archdeacon as one convicted of manifest evil doing to the venison, while John himself, who a few years later was Treasurer of England, was amerced ten marks for harbouring him after his evil deeds.

Again, in January $125\frac{0}{1}$ a clerk[4] was found trespassing by night in the forest of Rockingham. The foresters demanded gage and pledge of him, but according to the record he could not find pledges to them. This was only another way of recording that he claimed his clerical privilege. Nevertheless the foresters arrested him, but he managed to escape from their custody. The record is unfortunately damaged,

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 70, *Roll* 3.
[2] 10 March $125\frac{3}{4}$.
[3] See pp. 12, 13, 77, 78 below.
[4] See pp. 33, 94 below.

and it cannot be ascertained whether he escaped by his own efforts or with the assistance of some of his fellow clerks.

When a clerk had once been arrested and imprisoned, the sheriff was not entitled to release him without a proper warrant. The following entry,[1] however, shows that the delivery would be made to the bishop and not to pledges, as was the practice in the case of laymen.

Presentatum est per eosdem quod Bate de Lyueden et Gilebertus[2] de Donestan' capti fuerunt apud Ouerton' et liberati Iohanni le Moyne tunc uicecomiti Huntind' ad inprisonandum ; ideo mandatum est uicecomiti qui nunc est quod faciat uenire ipsum Iohannem le Myne et quod distringat ipsum quod ueniret die Sabbati post octabas apostolorum Petri et Pauli. Ad diem uenit uicecomes et produxit Gilebertum de Dunston' qui detentus est in prisona. Et de Bate de Lyueden' dicunt quod clericus fuit et tempore uacacionis[3] episcopatus Linc' deliberatus fuit archiepiscopo Cantuar' ; set nullum inde profert warrantum ; ideo dictus Iohannes, tunc uicecomes inde responsurus est etc. Et testatum est per uiridarios quod dictus Gilebertus non fuit malefactor nisi solummodo quod fuit cum Roberto de Longueuill' et non consenciens malefactis suis. Et iacuit in prisona de Cantebr' per duos annos ; ideo inde quietus. Postea taxatur Robertus de Longueuile ad quadraginta solidos.[4]

Robert de Longeville, mentioned in this entry was himself a clerk, being the parson of Orton or Overton in the county of Huntingdon, whom the foresters and verderers had already presented as an evil doer in the forest. It should be noticed that, like the parsons of Barnack and Polebrook, he does not make fine for his offence but is taxed.

On the rolls[5] of the Nottingham eyre of 1334 there are no traces of a special procedure for clerks. But this may be partly explained by a change in procedure which applied to both clerks and laymen. In the thirteenth century when a layman failed to appear at the forest eyre, the sheriff was ordered to cause him to come on a given day, and when a clerk failed to appear, a similar order was sent to the bishop. If either clerk or layman again failed on the given day, he was exacted

[1] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 68, *Roll* 2d.

[2] MS. 'Gilebertum.'

[3] The vacancy was after the death of Robert Grossetête on 9 October 1253.

[4] Another example occurs in the rolls of the Northampton eyre of 1255 :

'Presentatum est et conuictum per forestarios et uiridarios quod die sancti Thome apostoli anno tricesimo primo Petrus de Nohers et [Robertus] Fynch de Clyue capti fuerunt cum arcubus et sagittis in Firma de Nassincton'; et missi fuerunt ad prisonam de Norhamt'. Et Robertus Fynch fuit deliberatus per breue domini regis. . . . Et Petrus de Nohers liberatus fuit magistro Willelmo de Lyndesy atornato episcopi Linc' ad clericos capiendos eo quod clericus fuit ; ideo preceptum est uicecomiti quod uenire faciat magistrum et decanum etc. Postea uenit Petrus de Nohers et finem fecit per duas marcas.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 68, *Roll* 1.)

[5] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 132.

in the county court; and if he did not then come he was outlawed. But in the fourteenth century, if either clerk or layman failed to appear at the eyre on the first day, he was forthwith exacted in the county court without any second day being given to him. It is for this reason that we find no entries of mandates being sent to the bishop on the eyre rolls of the reign of Edward III.

Again the mere absence of entries on the eyre rolls recording the delivery of clerks to the attorneys of the bishop is not proof that such delivery no longer took place. In many of the eyre rolls of the reign of Henry III., there are no such entries; yet we know that the bishops used to appoint attorneys, whose business it was to attend the eyre and demand the delivery of clerks convicted of trespasses against the forest laws. There was, in general, no special object for enrolling the delivery, and in spite of the silence of the rolls, the practice may have continued.

VII.

THE EXTENT OF THE FORESTS.

On 6 November 1217, the infant king Henry III. was made to issue the Charter [1] of the Forest, which contained the following two chapters respecting the boundaries of the forests:

> Inprimis omnes foreste quas Henricus rex auus noster afforestauit uideantur per bonos et legales homines; et si boscum aliquem alium quam suum dominicum afforestauerit ad dampnum illius cuius boscus fuerit, deafforestentur. Et si boscum suum proprium afforestauerit, remaneat foresta, salua communa de herbagio et aliis in eadem foresta illis qui eam prius habere consueuerunt.
>
> Omnes autem bosci qui fuerunt afforestati per regem Ricardum auunculum nostrum, uel per regem Iohannem patrem nostrum usque ad primam coronationem nostram, statim deafforestentur nisi fuerit dominicus boscus noster.

The language of the Charter is notable. A forest was a district which might include both woods and open country; yet it was only woods which were to be disafforested. Perhaps in some cases the kings had afforested woods in the neighbourhood of their forests but had allowed the open country which surrounded them to remain exempt or partially [2] exempt from the forest laws. It is probable, how-

[1] A facsimile of the charter will be found in *Statutes of the Realm*, i. p. 20.

[2] It should be noticed that the justices who were appointed to inquire into the

ever, that the word 'boscus' was not intended to be construed literally, but was used loosely of districts which were assumed to be for the most part wooded. Again, the woods which Henry II. had afforested were only to be disafforested when they had been afforested to the damage of their owners. A qualification so vague as this was open to very different interpretations by the king and the owners of the woods. But more significant than the language of the Charter were the actual conditions under which the disafforestments were to be made. The woods which king Henry II. had afforested were to be viewed by good and loyal men, and there was to be no disafforestment until they had been viewed; but the woods which king Richard or king John had afforested were to be forthwith disafforested and no view of them was necessary.

Pursuant to the Charter letters patent[1] were issued on 24 July 1218, directing perambulations of the forest to be made by twelve knights, elected for the purpose, by view of John Marshall, who was then justice of the forest. A few of the perambulations still exist, the following[2] being one of them:

Hec est perambulacio[3] foreste facta in comitatu Rotelandie die[4] sancti Iacobi apostoli anno regni regis Henrici tercii secundo coram Iohanne Marresscall', tunc iusticiario[5] foreste, Willelmo de Auben', Hugone de Nevill' et aliis fidelibus domini regis per Alanum Basset, Mattheum filium Thome, Robertum Luuet, Radulfum Tailbard, Andream de Keten', Ricardum Alebast', Bartholomeum de Piltun, Simonem Lesquier, Hugonem filium Simonis, Ricardum filium Reginaldi, Robertum de Colestun', Ricardum filium Rogeri, scilicet, qui predicti iurati dicunt quod Henricus rex auus domini regis Henrici tercii post primam coronacionem suam afforestauit quasdam partes de Roteland' uersus Stanfort inter Weland' et aquam que currit inter Burle et Egiltun' et descendit per medium parcum de Bernardish' usque ad pontem de Magna Caterstun', scilicet, a quodam chimino qui dirigitur per metas et bundas subscriptas, scilicet, a quodam uado de Litilhe sub Kaldechot per medium Kaldechot; et deinde per medium Lidingtun' . . . .

boundaries of the forests in December 1219 were directed to inquire what woods had been put within the regard by king John, and what woods had been put in defense by him. (See *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 434.) This direction points to the king having partially afforested certain districts. By putting woods within the regard, he prohibited wastes and essarts. By putting them in defense, he prohibited hunting in them. The expression 'to put in defense' seems, however, sometimes to have denoted merely the exclusion of sheep and cattle from pasture. See pp. 47, 48 below.

[1] Patent Roll 18, m. 2. They are printed in *Rymeri Foedera*, vol. i. part i. p. 151.

[2] *For. Proc.*, *Anc. Chanc.*, *No.* 8.

[3] This perambulation should be compared with the one made in 9 Hen. iii. printed in *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 208, and with the one made on 7 December 1299, printed on p. 116 below. The boundaries of the forest of Rutland as they were at the end of the reign of Hen. iii. are printed on p. 53 below.

[4] Wednesday, 25 April 1218.

[5] John Marshall was appointed justice of the forest by letters patent dated 8 November 1217. (See Patent Roll, 17 m. 9.) At this time there was only one justice of the forest for all England.

extendit se contra collem de Bidisbroc usque ad quandam antiquam fossatam inter Bidisbroc et Uppinha' et descendit in occidente de Childeslund' usque in uallem inter Prestun' et Wenge; et ab illo ualle usque ad uiridem keminum inter Martinestorp' et Manetun' usque ad pontem sub Manetun'; et deinde per uallem sub Gunetorp' usque per[1] unum caput de Egiltun' uersus australem; et deinde usque ad quendam uadum in predicta aqua currente inter Burle et Egoluestun', qui uadus appellatur Thuiford. Et in huius rei ueritate predicti milites sigilla sua apposuerunt in testimonium.

The Charter of the Forest had been issued in the name of the king, but with the seals of Gualo the papal legate and William Marshall, Earl of Pembroke, the king himself having had no seal during the first two years of his reign. At the beginning of his third regnal year, however, a seal was made for him with which all letters patent and close, though attested by William Marshall[2] or Hubert of Burgh, and not by the king, were sealed. At the same time the council issued an ordinance,[3] declaring that no grants in perpetuity should be made by the king until he was of full age. In spite of this ordinance[4] the Charter of the Forest, which was a grant in perpetuity, was not revoked. There can be no doubt on this point, for on 22 April 1219 letters patent[5] were issued to Peter de Maullay directing him to make a perambulation between the parts of the counties of Somerset and Dorset which ought to be disafforested and the parts which ought to remain forest. Similar letters patent[6] were issued on 1 May of the same year with respect to perambulations in the counties of Nottingham and Derby; and again[7] on 20 July, with respect to the county of Huntingdon.[8] In all these letters patent there is a clause directing the perambulation to be sent to the

[1] This and the following word are written as '*per* vn*um*' in the MS., the letters in italics representing contractions. 'Unum' seems to be the correct reading for vn*um*, but the letter *u* might be read as an *n* or even as a *y*.

[2] After the death of the Earl Marshal in May 1219, letters patent and close were usually attested by Hubert of Burgh.

[3] It is printed in *Rymeri Foedera*, vol. i. part i. p. 152.

[4] The ordinance against grants in perpetuity was strictly observed. In a few cases markets and fairs were granted, but the grants were only to remain in force until the king attained his majority. (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 463.)

[5] Patent Roll 19, m. 4.

[6] Ibid. m. 3.

[7] Ibid.

[8] The following entries appear upon the Great Roll of the Pipe of the year 3 Hen. iii.: 'Homines de comitatu Huntind' debent quadraginta marcas pro deafforestandis forestis que deafforestari debent et separari ab hiis que permanebunt foreste secundum tenorem carte de libertatibus foreste.' (Pipe Rolls 63, Roll 6.) 'Homines de Dorset et Sumerset . . . . centum libras pro perambulacione facienda inter partes illas in comitatibus de Dorset' et Sumerset' que deaforestande sunt et illas que remanebunt secundum tenorem carte regis de libertatibus foreste et pro metis et terminis ponendis inter utrasque partes illas et pro deafforestatione parcium illarum que deafforestande sunt sicut predictum est secundum metas et terminos predictos.' (Pipe Rolls 63, Roll 14 *d.*)

There is a blank space on the roll after the fifth word, namely, 'Sumerset,' in the above passage.

king, 'in order that afterwards thereof might be enacted that which it might seem fitting to our council to do.'

It is a matter of doubt whether perambulations were made in the years 1218 and 1219 in all those counties in which there were forests. But if they were made, they seem to have been considered unsatisfactory. For in December 1219 seven sets of justices were appointed [1] to inquire in seven groups of counties respectively what forests ought to be disafforested. The letters sent to the justices were comprehensive, and differed in form and substance from those by which justices were appointed in subsequent perambulations. They began as follows:

Rex Sarr' episcopo salutem. Sciatis quod constituimus uos una cum uenerabili patre I. Baton' episcopo et dilectis et fidelibus nostris comite Sarr' uel illo quem idem comes loco suo ad hoc posuerit et Willelmo Briwer' et Willelmo de Neuill' ad inquisicionem faciendam in comitibus Dors' et Sumers' et Wiltesir' que foreste afforestate fuerunt per dominum I. regem patrem nostrum et qui bosci positi fuerunt per eundem imfra regardum et prius fuerunt extra regardum et similiter qui bosci positi fuerunt per eundem in defensum; et quas forestas uicecomites et castellani et alii bailliui nostri tenent preter forestas quas forestarii de feodo tenent; et que foreste afforestate fuerunt per Henricum regem auum nostrum tempore Alani de Neuill' uel tempore aliorum forestariorum suorum de uoluntate ipsius regis uel de uoluntate aliorum forestariorum suorum.

The letters then directed the justices to disafforest forthwith the forests which they should find to have been afforested by King John; to put out of the regard the woods which had formerly been out of the regard; and to put out of defense the woods which had formerly been out of defense; to seize all the forests which the sheriffs, castellans and other bailiffs held (but not the forests held by foresters in fee), and deliver the forests so seized in each county to two knights and a clerk of the county, to hold until further orders, and to report their finding about the forests which had been afforested by Henry II. or his foresters to Hubert of Burgh and the king's council, in order that the forests might be disafforested if the report were satisfactory. It is probable that the justices disafforested certain districts which had been afforested by king John, and that the council was dissatisfied

[1] The letters close, which were dated 13 December 1219, were enrolled on the close roll. (See *Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 434·*b*.) The seven groups of counties were: (1) Dorset, Somerset and Wiltshire; (2) Hampshire, Surrey and Berkshire; (3) Oxford and Buckingham; (4) Nottingham and Derby, Northampton, Huntingdon, Rutland and Leicester; (5) York, Cumberland and Northumberland; (6) Salop, Stafford, Worcester and Hereford; (7) Gloucester. It will be observed that no justices were appointed for the county of Essex, in which there was a forest. In most of the other counties for which no justices were appointed here were no forests.

with the report concerning the forests which had been afforested by Henry II. or his foresters. There is certainly no entry on the Patent or Close Rolls directing a disafforestment in consequence of the report of the justices. But the absence of such a direction is not conclusive evidence that no disafforestment took place.

On 10 December 1223, the attestation of letters patent and close by Hubert of Burgh ceased and henceforth they are attested by the king himself. But the ordinance in restraint of grants in perpetuity remained in force, the king being still an infant.

On 30 October 1224, Hugh de Neville, the justice [1] of the forest, was directed [2] to cause the forest to be kept and the regards to be made as in the reign of king John before the war between him and his barons. This direction is recorded on the patent rolls without any introductory or explanatory statement; but it certainly does not amount to a revocation of the Charter of the Forest, as it only affects two of its chapters. On 11 February, in the following year the Charter was again issued without any alteration in its provisions; but it is expressed to be made 'spontanea et bona uoluntate nostra,' and concludes with a statement that it was granted in return for a fifteenth of all movables, and that neither the king nor his heirs would purchase anything by which the liberties contained in the charter should be infringed, and that if he should purchase any such thing it should be reckoned as null.

On 16 February 1225, being five days only after the second issue of the Charter, justices [3] were appointed [4] to make perambulations in accordance with its provisions; and on the same day the sheriff of York was directed to cause its observance in his bailiwick. Woods, however, were not to be felled or venison taken on account of the perambulation until it had been made and presented to the king and he had given such orders as should seem good to him and his council. Similar directions were sent on the same day to the

[1] Hugh de Neville was appointed justice of the forest by letters patent dated 29 April 1224. (See Patent Roll 31, m. 8.)

[2] Patent Roll 32, m. 9; *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 1.

[3] Hugh de Neville, Brian de l'Isle and Henry of Cerne were appointed by letters patent dated 16 February 1224 justices to make perambulations in the following counties: Somerset, Dorset, Northampton, Leicester, Rutland, Nottingham and Derby, York, Oxford, Northumberland, Cumberland, Buckingham, Hampshire, Wiltshire and Berkshire. In each county two or more knights were associated to the justices. On the same day three other justices were appointed to make perambulations in the counties of Worcester, Stafford, Salop and Warwick; and also two justices in each of the following counties: Lancaster, Surrey and Huntingdon. The appointment of the justices in Surrey was afterwards revoked and Hugh de Neville, Brian de l'Isle and Henry of Cerne were appointed for Essex, Surrey and Sussex. (See Patent Roll 32 a, mm. 6, 5 *in dorso*.)

[4] *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 70.

sheriff of Northumberland, and on 1 May 1225 to the sheriff of Rutland.[1] It is probable that they were also sent at different dates to the sheriffs of other counties in which there were forests. On 8 May in the same year the justices were directed [2] to cause the Charter of the Forest to be observed in the different counties according to the perambulations which they had already made. In the counties in which perambulations [3] had not yet been made, it was to be observed according to the perambulations as soon as they were made. In the case of Rutland a special mandate [4] was sent to the justice of the forest on 5 August ordering him to observe the perambulation just as it had been made, but to retain in the king's hands his demesne woods of Oakham and Ridlington.

Although the Charter was made in the name and under the seal of the king, he was still an infant, and the ordinance in restraint of perpetuity had not been revoked. Early in January 1227 the king declared [5] that he was of full age.[6] On the 22nd of that month he made [7] his first grant in perpetuity, having on the previous day proclaimed by letters addressed to the sheriffs, that he would cause charters and confirmations to be made under his seal, and ordered that all who had or claimed to have lands, tenements or liberties by the gift or grant and confirmation of his antecessors should come forthwith to show by what warrant they claimed them. He also proclaimed in the same letters that all who wished to purchase charters or confirmations of lands, tenements, markets, liberties or anything whatever should come to him for that purpose. For some months the clerks in the chancery were exceptionally busy. New charters were granted, and old ones were confirmed. Every grant raised a question of expediency, and every confirmation one of validity. It was a time of inquiry into the king's rights and property.

It is not surprising that the young king on attaining his political majority, challenged [8] some of the disafforestments which had been

[1] Ibid. p. 72.

[2] Ibid. p. 73.

[3] A few of the perambulations are recorded upon the Close Rolls: namely, Surrey (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 56), Sussex (ibid. 80), Leicestershire (ibid. 207), Nottinghamshire and Rutland (ibid. 208), Huntingdon (ibid. 209).

[4] Ibid. p. 80.

[5] *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 207.

[6] The attestations of letters patent and close show that the king was at Oxford on 8, 9, 10 January $122\frac{6}{7}$. According to the Annals of Worcester, he declared that the was of full age on 9 January. (*Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, vol. iv. p. 419.)

[7] Charter Roll 18, m. 36.

[8] It is clear, however, that even before the king had declared his majority it had been decided that there should be a revision of the perambulations. On 27 September 1226 the abbot of Abingdon and seven other persons were ordered to bring before the king the charters of the king's predecessors under which they claimed liberties in the forest and the disafforested districts. On 26 October the perambulations of certain forests were temporarily revoked. (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 156. See also the letters close of 22 June 1226, ibid. 153.)

made, pursuant to the Charter, during his infancy. Vast tracts of land had been put out of the forest at a time when he had no power to grant a market, a fair, or even an acre of land to a man and his heirs. Disafforestment, resulting as it necessarily did in the loss of fines, amercements and other profits, was from its very nature an act of disinheritance. In many cases there was good reason for believing that portions of the forest had been wrongly disafforested. But instead of revoking[1] the Charter, the king took a more sagacious step, which showed considerable political ability.

The king had declared that he was of full age when he was at Oxford on 9 January 1227. On the day following, before he had issued a single charter or proclaimed his majority to the sheriffs, he directed[2] the sheriff of Shropshire to summon all the foresters in fee in his bailiwick to come before the king, to show by what warrant they held their offices. He also sent a similar direction concerning all persons who before the making of the Charter had enjoyed any exemption or liberty in the forest in his bailiwick. Finally he directed him to cause the persons who had made the perambulation to come before him to show why they had disafforested certain parts of the forest which had been afforested before the coronation of Henry II., and why they had disafforested certain of his demesne lands and woods. Similar directions were sent on the same day to the sheriffs of Rutland, Nottingham and Leicester, and on 8 February to the sheriffs of Hampshire, Berkshire, Oxford and Huntingdon. No doubt he expected that the foresters in fee and other persons summoned would produce charters granted by the predecessors of Henry II. capable of throwing light on the boundaries of the forest before the coronation of that king. By their aid places might be shown to have lain within the forest which had been put out of it by the disafforestment of 1225.

On 9 February[3] the knights who had made the perambulations in the counties of Leicester, Rutland and Huntingdon came before the king and acknowledged that they had wrongly disafforested portions of the forest which, owing to the civil war, had ceased to be forest

[1] There has been some misunderstanding as to what the king did at this time. He dealt with the perambulations as stated above, and he granted confirmations of charters granted by his predecessors, in return for which he, no doubt, received a large sum of money. It was the usual practice for the kings to grant confirmations of charters on accession. The 'charters' which Mathew Paris (*Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, vol. iii. p. 122) states that the king quashed, were the perambulations which had been ratified by the king's seal during his minority. He had made no charters during his minority, except the Great Charter and the Forest Charter. There is no evidence that he quashed either of them.

[2] *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 206.

[3] Ibid. ii. 169.

during the reign of Stephen, and had been reafforested by Henry II. after his coronation. Accordingly he directed that the forests in these three counties, should be kept as they were before the perambulations had been made. About the same time the knights who had made the perambulation in Nottinghamshire acknowledged that they had wrongly disafforested two places and obtained leave to certify themselves of their true boundaries. The king then directed that no person having woods in those places should fell, sell or essart them, until it had been determined what were the boundaries.[1]

On 13 August the king sent[2] letters close to seventeen of his sheriffs consisting of an order relating to Magna Carta and directions relating to the forest, similar in form to those which he had sent on 10 January to the sheriff of Shropshire. On the same day he sent the order relating to Magna Carta to the sheriff of Northumberland, and also to the sheriffs of Nottingham and Derby, Warwick and Leicester, Rutland, Cambridge and Huntingdon, Berkshire, Bedford and Buckingham. After the enrolment of the names of these counties on the Close Roll, it is stated that although they are in the forest[3] they had not the long form (meaning the letters close sent to the first seventeen sheriffs), because they were quit, but they had the short form (meaning the order relating to Magna Carta), together with the underwritten sheriffs, namely those of Sussex,[4] Kent, Middlesex, Norfolk and Suffolk.

Thus the short form was sent to the sheriffs of the counties in which there were no forests, and also to the sheriffs of the counties which contained forests about the boundaries of which the king was already satisfied. He had pardoned[5] the knights who had made the perambulations in Rutland, Leicester, Huntingdon and Nottingham by letters patent dated 9 February then last past. He had disafforested[6] by a charter dated 10 May a portion of the county of Berkshire, and the boundaries of the forest in that county were no longer in question. It is not recorded that he had pardoned the knights who had made the perambulations in the counties of Derby,[7]

[1] On 20 April 1228 the knights who had made perambulations in the following counties were pardoned by the king for their errors: namely, Lancaster, Stafford, Salop, Worcester, Surrey and Northampton. (Patent Roll 36, m. 5.) The knights who made the perambulation in Yorkshire were pardoned on 31 October 1228. (Patent Roll 37, m. 12.)

[2] *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 212.

[3] It should not be inferred from this that there were forests in Cambridgeshire and Bedfordshire. The former county had a sheriff in common with Huntingdonshire, and Bedfordshire had one in common with Buckinghamshire.

[4] Northumberland is mentioned on the roll together with these five counties, but evidently by mistake. The order relating to Magna Carta was sent to its sheriff, as stated in the roll, who was quit. The forest in Northumberland was disafforested in the reign of Ed. i. See p. cviii below.

[5] Patent Roll 34, m. 8.

[6] Charter Roll 18, m. 5.

[7] But see p. cviii, *note* 4, below.

Buckingham and Warwick, but the explanation may well be that he was not dissatisfied with their work.

In the course of the next two years the perambulations which had been made in the remaining counties were examined. Where districts had been wrongly disafforested they were reafforested. But the king neither repudiated the Charter of the Forest nor annulled the perambulations which had been made in his infancy. He merely corrected[1] them, after due inquiry. Where Henry II. had afforested a district for the first time it was no longer allowed to remain in the forest, but where he had reafforested what had been forest before the civil wars of the reign of Stephen the perambulations were to that extent set aside.

But although the revision of the perambulations was neither unjust nor unreasonable, it was, as might be expected, unpopular. People who had enjoyed complete immunity from the forest laws would resent their reimposition, whether it was just or unjust. Among the articles which formed the barons' petition in the year 1260 was one which gave expression to the feeling of dissatisfaction.[2]

> Item petunt remedium quod bosci et terre infra metas foreste non existentes, qui per ambulacionem proborum hominum, et per quindecimam partem omnium bonorum hominum Anglie domino regi datam deafforestati fuerunt, per uoluntatem suam reafforestauit.

Nevertheless the barons did not succeed in obtaining redress for this particular grievance. On several occasions during the reign of Henry III. the Charter was confirmed, but the confirmations were never followed by fresh perambulations and the boundaries of the forest remained the same after the battle of Evesham as they were before it. Nor was Edward I. willing that the boundaries of the forest as settled by his father should be disturbed. It was only at the end of his reign, under strong political pressure, that he consented to the disafforestment of any portions of his forests. In March 1277 he had directed[3] Walter Scamel, and Mathew de Colombières to cause a perambulation to be made of the forests south of the Trent.

[1] Thus the concluding words of the writ to the sheriff of Hampshire concerning the revision of the perambulations in that county are as follows:

'Et ideo tibi precipimus quod sine dilacione clamari facias per totam balliuam tuam quod foresta custodiatur per eosdem terminos et easdem metas per quas custodita fuit tempore I. regis patris nostri ante gwerram motam inter ipsum et barones suos Anglie exceptis partibus predictis quas dictus Henricus rex auus noster afforestauit; et firmiter prohiberi facias quod nullus in eadem foresta de uiridi uel uenacione forisfaciat contra assisam foreste nostre, et quod arcus et sagitte brachetti et leporarii inde penitus amoueantur.' (Close Roll 38, m. 9 *d.*)

[2] *Annales Monastici*, *Burton*, Rolls Series, p. 440.

[3] *For. Proc.*, *Anc. Chanc.*, *No.* 101.

Edwardus dei gracia rex Anglie dominus Hibernie et dux Aquitanie dilectis et fidelibus suis magistro W. Scamel, decano Sarr', et M. de Columbar' salutem. Quia uolumus quod carta nostra de foresta in omnibus et singulis articulis suis inuiolabiliter obseruetur secundum quod nuper in consilio nostro apud Westmonasterium puplicari fecimus, assignauimus uos ad eligendum duodecim de discrecioribus et legalioribus tam militibus quam aliis probis hominibus de singulis comitatibus subscriptis, scilicet, de comitatu Roteland', Northampton, Salop, Stafford, Berk', Oxon', Wygorn', Herford', Gloucester, Wilt', Dors', Som', Sutht', Surr', Sussex, Huntyndon', Buk', et Essex ut conuocatis militibus et probis hominibus predictis necnon forestariis et uiridariis forestarum eorundem comitatuum per uisum illorum duodecim fiat perambulacio recta illa scilicet que facta fuit tempore domini Henrici regis patris nostri que nondum calumpniata fuit et ut alii articuli in eadem carta contenti compleantur. Et ideo uobis mandamus quod ad dies et loca, que ad hoc prouideritis, et uicecomitibus nostris comitatuum predictorum scire feceritis, premissa faciatis in forma predicta. Mandauimus eciam eisdem uicecomitibus nostris quod ad eosdem dies et loca uenire faciant coram uobis omnes milites comitatuum predictorum et quosdam alios probos et legales homines de eisdem comitatibus ad hoc sufficientes. Et ipsi uicecomites ibidem uobis occurrant ad premissa, sicut predictum est perficienda ita quod perambulacio illa fiat et alii articuli in eadem carta contenti perficiantur iuxta tenorem carte supradicte et secundum quod uos eisdem uicecomitibus scire facietis ex parte nostra ita tamen quod nichil demandetur execucioni donec de ipso distincte et aperte et absque calumpnia facta et nobis sub sigillis uestris et sigillis dictorum militum presentata, preceperimus fieri quod de consilio nostro prouiderimus faciendum. In cuius rei testimonium has literas nostras fieri fecimus patentes. Teste me ipso apud Dunstapl' primo die Marcii anno regni nostri quinto.

Pursuant to these letters patent perambulations were made and complaints presented against the violation of the charter by the forest officers. A few returns have survived which show that the people suffered from unlawful exactions and hoped for a curtailment of the districts over which they could be practised. But it should not be assumed that the findings of the jurors were in all cases historically correct. More than fifty years had elapsed since the second issue of the charter; more than a century since the first coronation of Henry II. Intervals such as these were sufficiently long for tradition to develop according to the wishes and the interests of the people. The Somerset jurors recorded the boundaries of their forests, and then added[1] that, with those exceptions, all Somerset was and ought

[1] 'Exceptis supradictis forestis tota Somerseta est extra forestam et debet esse, set aliquo tempore fuit afforestata, scilicet, post primam coronacionem Henrici regis aui domini regis Henrici filii regis Iohannis per regem Iohannem, quando afforestauit totam Angliam. Et postea deafforestata fuit per regem Henricum filium suum.' (*For. Proc.*, *Anc. Chanc.*, *No.* 101.)

to be outside the forest; but it was sometime afforested, to wit, after the first coronation of king Henry the grandfather of king Henry the son of king John, by king John when he afforested all England; and it was afterwards disafforested by king Henry his son. King John certainly prohibited [1] fowling throughout England; he may also have prohibited hunting in some counties; but there is no evidence that he ever afforested his whole kingdom.

In the autumn of the year 1297 Edward I. confirmed [2] the Charter of the Forest. On 16 October in the same year, six justices were sent [3] to make perambulations of the forests both north and south of the Trent; two being assigned to each of three groups of counties. The letters patent, by which they were appointed, closely resembled those by which Walter Scamel and Mathew de Colombières had been appointed in 1277, the word 'perambulacio' being again qualified by 'scilicet, que facta tempore domini Henrici regis patris nostri que nondum calumpniata fuit.' In the next month, however, these letters patent were revoked [4] and others issued, by which eight justices were appointed to make perambulations, two being assigned to each of four [5] groups of counties. In the new letters patent the word 'perambulacio' was not qualified as it had been before. Perambulations seem to have been made by the justices shortly afterwards, though perhaps not in all counties. An official record of the perambulations [6] made in Hampshire is preserved at the Public Record Office and the perambulations [7] which were made in Somerset are recorded in a register of Wells Cathedral. Others may yet be found in monastic and private chartularies.

As the boundaries of the forests had been settled with great care in the early years of the reign of Henry III., there was no reason why they should again be changed. In spite, therefore, of the confirmation of the charter and the resulting perambulations, the forests were not reduced in size. But in the autumn of the year 1298 the king

[1] 'Anno domini MCCIX rex Anglorum Iohannes ad natale Domini fuit apud Bristollum et ibi capturam auium per totam Anglie interdixit.' (*Chronica Rogeri de Wendover*, Rolls Series, ii. 49.)

[2] By letters patent (inspecting the charter) dated 12 October 1297. See *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 120.

[3] Patent Roll 116, m. 3.

[4] Patent Roll 117, m. 32; *Parliamentary Writs*, i. 396.

[5] The four groups were: (1) Essex, Huntingdon, Northampton, Rutland, Surrey and Sussex; (2) Oxford, Berkshire, Buckingham, Hampshire and Wiltshire; (3) Gloucester, Worcester, Hereford, Salop, Stafford, Somerset and Dorset; (4) Nottingham, Derby, York, Lancaster, Westmoreland, and Cumberland. The appointment of justices in the second of these groups was afterwards revoked, and two other justices were appointed in their place by letters patent dated 8 February 1298. Patent Roll 117, m. 27; *Parliamentary Writs*, i. p. 397.

[6] *Duchy of Lancaster, For. Proc., Bundle* 1, *No.* 8.

[7] They are printed in Collinson's *History of Somerset*, iii. 56.

appointed commissioners[1] to go through all the counties of England to inquire into the misdeeds of the forest officers and of those who were in arrear in making the perambulations. From this it seems that the forest charter was to be enforced as far as it related to the oppression of the inhabitants, and that the king intended the boundaries, such as they were, to be respected by the foresters.

In April 1299 a new statute,[2] the 'Statutum de Finibus Leuatis,' was enacted which incorporated all the Charter of the Forest, except the first five articles. Although the articles in the Charter which relate to disafforestment were omitted from the statute, there is a clause in it which declares that the king was willing that a perambulation should be made 'saving always his oath, the right of his crown, and his exceptions and challenges, and those of other persons' but 'so that such perambulation be reported to him before any execution or anything else be done thereupon.' Five justices,[3] all of whom were judges of great experience, were directed,[4] by letters patent dated 23 September, to make perambulations of the forests north and south of the Trent. Perambulations[5] were made by these justices in five counties, namely, Northampton, Huntingdon, Rutland, Oxford and Surrey. It is probable, however, that they performed their work too slowly to satisfy anybody; for on 1 April 1300 the king again directed[6] perambulations to be made, this time by six sets of justices each in a particular group[7] of counties. The letters patent by which they were appointed contained reservations similar to those in the Statute of Fines, concerning the king's rights and the execution of the perambulations. In most of the forests the jurors paid no attention to the settlement of the boundaries made at the beginning of the reign of Henry III. They put out of the forest vast tracts of land which had been forest for a century and a half, alleging that they had been

[1] They were appointed by letters patent dated 18 November 1298. (See Patent Roll 117, m. 1.) The writ of summons for the inquiry is printed in *Parliamentary Writs*, i. 397.

[2] *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 126.

[3] They were Roger Brabancon, John of Berwick, Ralph of Hingham, William Inge and John of Croxley.

[4] Patent Roll 118, m. 9.

[5] The perambulation in Rutland is printed on p. 116 below; that in Surrey on p. 117 below; those in Northampton, Huntingdon and Oxford are recorded on *For. Proc., Anc. Chanc., No.* 102.

[6] Patent Roll 119, m. 19; *Parliamentary Writs*, i. 397.

[7] The six groups were: (1) Salop, Stafford and Derby; (2) Essex, Buckingham, Oxford; (3) Somerset, Dorset, and Devon; (4) Hampshire and Wiltshire; (5) Nottingham, York and Cumberland; (6) Gloucester, Hereford, Worcester and Warwick. It will be observed that, with the exception of Oxford, none of the five counties in which perambulations are known to have been made pursuant to the letters patent of 23 September 1299 are included in the above six groups. It is probable that no perambulation was made in Oxfordshire pursuant to the letters patent of 1 April 1300, as the disafforestment of 14 Feb. 1301 was based upon a perambulation made on the 22 February $1\frac{299}{300}$ pursuant to the letters patent of 23 September 1299. (See *For. Proc., Anc. Chanc., No.* 102.)

afforested by Henry II. or his sons Richard and John, and disregarding the distinction between districts which had been afforested for the first time and those which had been reafforested as ancient forest by Henry II. When they were asked what were their means of knowledge, they declared [1] that they knew from the tales of their ancestors and the common talk of the country.

On 25 September 1300 the king directed [2] the justices before whom the recent perambulations had been made to attend a parliament which was to be held at Lincoln on 25 January of the following year with a view to considering what they had done ; and a day later the sheriffs were ordered to cause all who had lands and tenements within the forest and who wished to challenge anything in the perambulations to come to the parliament and show their reasons. The justices of the forest north and south of the Trent were also ordered to cause the attendance of the foresters in fee, no doubt for the same reason as that for which they had been summoned in the reign of Henry III. On 14 February the king confirmed the Charter of the Forest and issued letters patent [3] disafforesting all districts which lay outside the boundaries found in the recent perambulations.

The disafforestments made at the Parliament of Lincoln were not final. They had been extorted from the king under political pressure ; there is good reason for supposing that they infringed his rights. It is not surprising, therefore, that he applied to his lord the pope for relief. On 29 December 1305 Clement V. revoked,[4] annulled, and quashed the grants which the king had made, and shortly afterwards the king [5] himself revoked and annulled his own grants and disafforestments.

[1] See p. 121 below.

[2] Close Roll 122, m. 2 *in dorso*; *Parliamentary Writs*, i. 88.

[3] The letters patent of disafforestment incorporate the perambulations upon which they are based. They are recorded upon the roll *For. Proc.*, *Anc. Chanc.*, *No.* 102, at the Record Office. The letters patent disafforesting portions of Huntingdon, Northampton, Rutland and Oxford recite perambulations made pursuant to the letters patent of 23 September 1299. Those disafforesting portions of the forest in other counties recite the perambulations made pursuant to the letters patent of 1 April 1300.

[4] The bull is printed in *Foedera Rymeri*, vol. i. part i. p. 978.

[5] It is clear that the king revoked the disafforestments which he granted at the Parliament of Lincoln. The fifth chapter of the Statute of the year 1306, known as 'Ordinatio Foreste,' begins as follows :

'Quoad illos uero, qui tempore quo foresta deafforestata fuit, transgressiones de uiridi aut venacione in foresta fecerunt, quia deafforestacionem eandem et ut sentencia excommunicacionis in contrauenientes fulminaretur quamquam de nostra bona uoluntate minime processisset, concessimus, quam quidem sentenciam dominus summus pontifex postmodum reuocauit, et quas concessionem et deafforestacionem ex certis causis reuocamus et eciam adnullamus, uolumus quod transgressiones huiusmodi perdonentur, transgressionibus illis exceptis, que in ea parte que foresta remansit commisse fuerunt.' (*Statutes of the Realm*, i. 149.)

But the boundaries which had been settled in the Parliament of Lincoln were not easily set aside in this way. Edward II. was compelled to consent to the disafforestments which his father Edward I. had allowed but afterwards revoked. His son Edward III. was made [1] to grant that the Charter of the Forest should be kept in every article; that the perambulations which were ridden in the time of king Edward his grandfather should be kept in the form in which they were then ridden and bounded; that thereupon a charter should be made to every shire where it was ridden; and that in such places where it was not ridden, it should be ridden by good men and lawful, and a charter thereupon made as is above stated. The case of Surrey was exceptional. There had been no disafforestment in this county, because the jurors of the perambulation made on 5 March 1300 in pursuance of the letters patent of 27 September 1299 had found [2] that no part of the forest ought to be disafforested, and therefore no perambulation was made pursuant to the letters patent of 1 April 1300. Accordingly the men of Surrey, alleging that there had been no perambulation in the time of Edward I. demanded that one should be made pursuant to the grant of Edward III. Letters patent were issued; a perambulation was made; and the whole county of Surrey was found to lie outside the forest. The king formally disafforested [3] the county on 26 December 1327. Six years later he ordered [4] that the forest should be kept by the same boundaries as in the time of the late king, notwithstanding the grant which he had made in the first year of his reign, as he understood from divers inquisitions taken in the time of his progenitors and from other memoranda in the exchequer that divers woods and open spaces in the county of Surrey ought to be afforested.

The perambulations made at the end of the reign of Edward I. are of great value in so far as they show what the boundaries of the forest were during the fourteenth and subsequent centuries. But except in a few cases they do not assist in determining the boundaries of the thirteenth century. In order to obtain information on this point, the metes and bounds which are occasionally recorded on the eyre rolls [5] of the reigns of Henry III. and Edward I. must be consulted. But on the rolls of some forests they are not recorded, and in such cases the

[1] By statute ii. of 1 Ed. iii. See *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 255.

[2] See pp. 117, 118 below.

[3] Patent Roll 168, m. 3.

[4] On 4 August 1333. See Close Roll 160, m. 3.

[5] Thus the metes and bounds of the forest of Rutland are set out on the eyre rolls of the year 1269 (see p. 53 below); those of Surrey on the eyre rolls of the year 1270 (see p. 61 below). It is probable that the metes and bounds recorded on the eyre rolls were merely the presentments of the forest officers and not the record of a perambulation specially made at the time of the eyre.

boundaries can only be ascertained by collecting the names of all places mentioned in the rolls as lying within the forest.

Until the boundaries of the different forests have been carefully ascertained it will be impossible to state even approximately how much of the kingdom was forest in the thirteenth century. In some counties there were no forests. Among the writs by which the Parliament of Lincoln of 1300 was summoned was one [1] which was addressed to the sheriffs of the counties in which there were forests. It is followed on the roll of letters close by a writ [2] to the sheriff of Lincoln and a statement that in the same manner an order was sent to the sheriffs of the counties in which there were no forests—namely, Norfolk, Suffolk, Cambridge, Bedford, Kent, Sussex, Middlesex, Leicester, Northumberland, Cornwall, Lancaster, and Hertford. In some of these counties there had been forests which in the year 1300 were forests no longer. By a charter dated 3 May 1204 king John disafforested [3] the marsh appurtenant to four towns in Lincolnshire—namely, Surfleet, Gosberchurch, Quadring and Donington—so that it is evident that there was a forest in that county at the beginning of the thirteenth century.[4] The same king, by a charter dated 22 March in the same year disafforested [5] all the county of Cornwall, except two moors and two groves, which he disafforested later in his reign. He also disafforested by a charter [6] dated 18 May 1204 all the county of Devon, except Dartmoor and Exmoor. On 10 October 1239 Henry III. granted [7] the forest of Dartmoor to his brother Richard earl of Cornwall. A portion of the forest of Exmoor [8] still remained in the county of Devon; but with this exception there was no forest in Devonshire after the year 1239. A considerable portion of the county of Leicester was forest until 20 February 123$\frac{5}{6}$, when it was disafforested [9] by king Henry III. in accordance with the first chapter of the Charter of the Forest. In

[1] Close Roll 122, m. 2 *in dorso*; *Parliamentary Writs*, i. 90 *b*.

[2] *Parliamentary Writs*, i. 91 *a*.

[3] *Rot. Chart.* p. 128.

[4] A letter in the usual form concerning a regard was sent to the sheriff of Lincoln in February 1229. See *Royal Letters, Hen. iii.* Rolls Series, i. 346.

[5] *Rotuli Chartarum*, pp. 122, 206.

[6] *Rotuli Chartarum*, p. 132.

[7] Charter Roll 33, m. 1.

[8] The forest of Exmoor seems to have extended into Devonshire in the reign of Ed. iii. At an inquisition held at Wells on 2 July 1366 it was found as follows: 'R. A. et W. T. ceperunt et occiderunt unum bouiculum cerui infra hundredum de Wytherugge infra regardum foreste predicte de Exemor', quod quidem regardum unum est et se extendit tam infra comitatum Somers' quam Deuon', die Lune proxima post festum Omnium Sanctorum anno predicto. . . . Et dicunt quod omnes ministri foreste predicte de comitatu Somers' omnino, licet dictum regardum pro parte est in comitatu Deuon', se intromittunt.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 309, *Skin* 10.)

[9] Charter Roll 29, m. 15.

Northumberland there was an extensive forest until the year 1280, when Edward I. disafforested[1] it in return for an annual rent of forty pounds. In Lancashire there was no royal forest in the reign of Edward I., because the king had granted the honour of Lancaster to his brother Edmund Crouchback, who was allowed to enforce the forest laws over the forests which it contained. It is also evident that there was a forest in Sussex at the beginning of the thirteenth century, for a perambulation[2] of it is recorded on the roll of letters close of 9 Henry III.

On the other hand, it is almost certain that none of the kings of England possessed any forests in the counties of Norfolk, Suffolk and Kent. There are no appointments of wardens and no grants of privileges which suggest the existence of any such forest; there are no records of a forest eyre, and no letters patent appointing justices for an eyre in any of these counties; nor are there any corresponding entries of fines and amercements for offences against the forest law on the Great Rolls of the Exchequer. For similar reasons it may be considered as probable that there were either no forests in Cambridgeshire, Bedfordshire, and Hertfordshire, or forests of a small extent only. But there is more occasion for doubt about these three counties than about Norfolk, Suffolk and Kent. Cambridgeshire and Huntingdonshire had a common sheriff, and they are treated as a single county on the Great Rolls of the Exchequer. It is therefore possible that some of the fines and amercements there recorded for forest trespasses relate to Cambridgeshire, and not to Huntingdonshire, in which there was undoubtedly a forest. The same difficulty occurs with respect to Bedfordshire, which had a sheriff in common with Buckinghamshire, and with respect to Hertfordshire, which had one in common with Essex. In Middlesex there was at one time a warren at Staines, which was also subject to the forest laws. This is evident from a charter of 18 August 1227, by which Henry III. disafforested[3] the warren and declared it free from all that pertained to forest and forester. With this exception there was certainly no forest in Middlesex in the thirteenth, and probably none in the twelfth century.

In all the other counties[4] there were forests varying considerably in size. Those which were most frequented by the kings were

[1] Charter Roll 74, m. 10, entry 76.

[2] *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 80 *b.*

[3] Charter Roll 19, m. 5. The charter is printed in full in *Munimenta Gildhalle Londoniensis*, Rolls Series, vol. ii. pt. i. p. 44.

[4] The history of the forest in Derbyshire deserves special study. It cannot be adequately treated in this volume.

probably the best stocked with venison and the most suited for hunting. King John, when in England, spent much of his time in visiting the forests of Sherwood, Rockingham, Essex and Clarendon; and it was from these that Henry III. usually made presents of deer to his friends.

VIII.

THE CHASE, THE PARK AND THE WARREN.

Chases.

There were certain districts, such as the chases of Dartmoor, Malvern and Cranbourne, in which the beasts of the forests were preserved, but which were nevertheless not subject to the whole body of the forest laws. Some of them, such as Dartmoor, had once been the property of the Crown, and had then been forests in every sense of the word. When, however, they passed by royal grant into the hands of subjects, they were considered to have lost many of the incidents of a forest. Others, again, such as Cranbourne chase, seem to have acquired such incidents of a forest as they possessed by title of prescription. From the early years of the reign of Edward I. these districts were usually described [1] in official documents as 'chases' to distinguish them from the royal forests over which the whole body of the forest law was enforced. The distinction was not rigidly observed, and to this day we speak of various districts as forests, although they passed out of the hands of the Crown long before the accession of Edward I.

It is impossible to describe with any accuracy the laws which obtained in the chases or private forests of the thirteenth century. As there is no series of records which is concerned with their administration, all that can be learnt about the subject must be derived from entries on the rolls of the courts of common law, instruments recorded upon the rolls of the Chancery, inquisitions on the deaths of tenants who happened to hold chases of the king in chief, and a few sources of a similar nature.

When once the king had granted a forest to a subject, the jurisdiction of the justices of the forest ceased. Verderers were no longer appointed by the king's writ, and there were no more sessions of

[1] In some letters patent of 1 September 1295 the following words occur: 'Liberam chaciam Willelmi de Brewosa que uocatur foresta sancti Leonardi.' (Patent Roll 113, m. 10 *d.*)

justices in eyre for pleas of the forest. Some of the king's rights with respect to the preservation of the beasts of the forest and the timber became vested in the new proprietor. The mere grant of the forest effected no such disafforestment as to enable its inhabitants to hunt and cut their timber at pleasure. In general, the restrictions under which they had lived continued, and it was only the machinery by which they were enforced that was altered.

The lord of a chase seems to have had the right of arresting through his foresters all persons found trespassing against the venison, and detaining them in prison until they made satisfaction, provided that they were taken in the act, or, in legal language, provided that they were taken 'with the mainour.' This at least was stated in a case in one of the principal courts of common law in the reign of Edward I. The enrolment of the proceedings is printed by Coke in the fourth part of his 'Institutes of the Laws of England,'[1] but unfortunately owing to a wrong reference the original cannot be found.

Ricardus de Cornubia et nouem alii attachiati fuerunt ad respondendum Iohanni de Sallaye quare ipsum ceperunt et in prisona detinuerunt per decem septimanas apud castrum de Knaresburgh' etc.

Ricardus et alii dicunt quod castrum et honor de Knaresburgh cum foresta de Bestagne fuit aliquando in seisina domini Henrici regis patris domini regis nunc et eo tempore fuit talis consuetudo in foresta predicta quod si quis indictatus fuerit per forestarios coram seneschallo eiusdem honoris de transgressione de uenacione facta in eadem foresta idem seneschallus tales transgressores ubicunque fuerint inuenti infra eandem libertatem predicti honoris licite potest arrestare et imprisonare et eos in prisona detinere quousque satisfecerint de transgressione etc. Qui rex Henricus dedit predictum honorem cum foresta etc. Ricardo fratri suo comiti Cornubie patri Edmundi comitis Cornubie qui toto tempore suo usus est tali libertate arrestandi etc.

Iohannes e contra dicit nullam talem fuisse consuetudinem arrestandi malefactores nisi quando capti fuerunt cum manuopere et hoc ab antiquiore tempore quia idem comes non habet ibidem forestam sed chaceam tantum. Et quod tempore Willelmi de Stoteuill' domini dicte chacee qui dedit regi Iohanni dictam chaceam et tempore dicti regis Iohannis et tempore regis Henrici patris dum dicta chacea fuit in manu sua nunquam arrestauerunt aliquos de transgressione in chacea illa nisi illos qui capti fuerunt cum manuopere et hoc offert uerificare per patriam etc.

Ideo preceptum est uicecomiti quod summoneat predictum comitem etc.

Again, a similar right seems to have been exercised by the lord of the free chase of Malvern, for in a memorandum,[2] which is printed in

[1] Coke's *Institutes*, fourth part (ed. 1797), p. 314.

[2] Nash's *History of Worcestershire*, vol. i. p. lxxiiii.

Nash's 'History of Worcestershire,' of the 'ancient liberties, royalty and customs belonging to the lordship and franches of Handley and unto the chase of Malvern' the following article occurs:

Item, if any of the foresters find any person or persons hunting within the said chase or bounds thereof or standing suspiciously, viz. stable standing, with hounds drawing or bloody hands, the same forester shall attach him or them, and bring them unto the castle of Handley, there to remain prisoners in a place called Bandbury chamber, until they have found sureties sufficient of their good harbouring against the game by obligation in c. shillings to the lord's use, to be levied upon the forfeiture of them or their surety.

Thus there was a considerable difference in procedure in royal forests and private chases. In forests the trespassers were arrested and detained in prison until they found pledges to appear at the forest eyre, when they were again imprisoned until they paid ransom. In chases, trespassers were merely detained in prison until they satisfied the lord with respect to their offences; and they could only be detained when they were taken with the mainour. It is probable that the measure of satisfaction to which the lord was entitled varied in different chases, but it may be regarded as certain that he could nowhere act arbitrarily. Any fine which he might exact would be either limited in amount or subject to assessment in his court.

But there is at least one case in which the whole body of forest laws was enforced over a private forest. On 28 June 1266, Henry III. granted [1] the castles, lands and tenements which had been forfeited by Robert, earl of Derby, to his own second son, Edmund, commonly called Crouchback. On 30 June 1267, he granted [2] him the honour, county, castle and town of Lancaster and all the king's demesnes in the county of Lancaster, with the vaccaries and forests of Wiresdale and Lonsdale, and the manor, castle and forest of Pickering in Yorkshire. These two grants seem to have included all the forests in the county of Lancaster, which had hitherto been treated as forests in the strict sense of the word. Henceforth, however, they were intended to be held by Edmund, not as forests, but as free chases. Accordingly when in 15 Edward I. a forest eyre was held at Lancaster by three justices who had recently been appointed to hold pleas [3] of the forest in the counties north of the Trent, those offences only were punished which had been committed

[1] Charter Roll 78, m. 4, Entry 22.

[2] Charter Roll 61, m. 4, and Charter Roll 78, m. 4, Entry 23.

[3] *Duchy of Lancaster Forest Proceedings, Bundle* 1, *No.* 7.

since the last eyre and before the grants of 1266 and 1267. The justices were not concerned with anything that happened in these forests after they had passed out of the king's hands. This state of things, however, did not continue long. On 25 May 1285, Edward I. granted a privilege to his brother Edmund, which was not allowed to other lords of chases. He permitted him to have justices to hold pleas of the forest according to the assize of the forest in the forests which he had by the grant of Henry III., as often as justices should be sent to hold pleas in the king's forests. The words of the letters patent [1] are as follows:

Pro Edmundo fratre regis.

Rex omnibus ad quos etc., salutem. Sciatis quod concessimus pro nobis et heredibus nostris Edmundo fratri nostro karissimo quod ipse et heredes sui imperpetuum habeant ad requisicionem suam in cancellaria nostra et heredum nostrorum regum Anglie certos iusticiarios per literas nostras et heredum nostrorum predictorum ad placita forestarum, quas idem frater noster habet ex dono domini Henrici regis patris nostri, secundum assisam foreste tenenda quociens nos et heredes iusticiarios nostros ad huiusmodi placita in forestis nostris tenenda iuxta consuetudinem regni nostri mittere contingat; et quod imperpetuum habeant certos iusticiarios per litteras nostras et heredum nostrorum, quociens opus fuerit ad transgressiones sibi factas in chaceis uel parcis suis audiendas et terminandas secundum legem et consuetudinem regni nostri; ita quod idem frater noster et heredes sui habeant redempciones fines amerciamenta et omnia alia de predictis placitis et transgressionibus proueniencia eodem modo quo nos et heredes nostri predicti ea haberemus si foreste chacee et parci predicti essent in manu nostra. In cuius etc. Teste rege apud Westm' uicesimo quinto die [2] Maii.

After the date of these letters patent the forests of Pickering and Lancashire were subject to all the laws which prevailed in the royal forests. The records of the eyres held by the justices of the earls are of the same form and deal with precisely the same matters as those which were held before the justices of the king. But although the privilege of having justices so granted to the earl of Lancaster was in the time of Edward I. unique, something very like it had been sought and perhaps obtained earlier in the century. Robert earl of Derby, whose earldom and honour, as we have seen, was granted to Edmund Crouchback in 1266, had himself applied [3] for leave to hold pleas of the forest in his forest between the rivers Ribble and Mersey. The substance of the king's answer seems to have been a direction for an inquiry as to what had been done in the matter on previous occasions.

[1] Patent Roll 103, m. 12. [2] 25 May 1285. [3] Close Roll 65, m. 7 *in dorso.*

Mandatum est G. de Langel' iusticiario foreste quod rex permitteret dictum G. tenere placita foreste comitis Derb' ad peticionem ipsius comitis inter Ribbell' et Mers'; et quia nescitur utrum comes habeat talem libertatem quod debeat huiusmodi placita tenere uel quod homines illius foreste debeant sequi placita foreste apud Lancastr'; et mandatum est eidem G. quod diligenter inquirat ueritatem in hac parte, et si constiterit quod dictus comes habeat libertatem huiusmodi placita tenere et quod predicti homines non debeant sequi placita foreste apud Lancastr' uel alibi, concessit rex quod dictus G. teneat placita foreste predicti comitis quatenus facere potest sine preiudicio regis. Teste rege.

Again, there is an entry [1] on the Close Roll of 35 Hen. III. which perhaps refers to an eyre then intended to be held by Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest in the forest of Dartmoor, which was at that time the property of Richard, earl of Cornwall.

Rex concessit R. comiti Cornubie quod post iter G. de Langel' in comitatu Notingh' ad placita foreste eat in forestam de Dertemor' ad negocia sua predicti comitis expedienda. Et mandatum est eidem G. quod post iter suum completum diuertat se ad forestam predictam pro negociis memoratis. Teste rege apud Wind' uicesimo primo die Ianuarii.

Some of the lesser incidents of a forest are often found as incidents of chases. Thus chiminage [2] was taken in the reign of Edward I. in the chase of Cranbourne, and in the same chase there was also a fence [3] month beginning a fortnight before Midsummer day in every year for the protection of the lord's deer.[4] In Malvern chase dogs were lawed [5] at regular intervals, according to a customary rule, which, however, differed a little from that which prevailed in the forests.[6] The lawing was called 'hombling,' and took place twice in seven years. All dogs which were found that could not or would not be drawn through a strap of eighteen inches and a barleycorn in length and breadth were hombled. The further joints of the two middle claws were cut clean away, and the master or owner of the dog was amerced

[1] Close Roll 65, m. 20 *in dorso*.

[2] *Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii. 245, 248, 253.

[3] Ibid. p. 255.

[4] It also appears that the foresters of the chase of Cranbourne committed acts of extortion in the reign of Edward i. The following presentment was made in Ed. i.:

'Item idem forestarii ad uoluntatem suam colligunt garbas per autumnum infra metas et bundas predictas in comitatu Wiltes'; et nichilominus post autumnum similiter metu extorquent communiter a populo iuxta illam chaciam manenti bladum trituratum ad bracianda scotalla sua, et postea per compulsionem illorum ueniunt ad scotalla sua. Et postea colligunt gallinas contra Natale Dei, agnos et pelles agnorum ad maximum grauamen tocius patrie predicte.' (*Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii. 249.)

[5] Nash's *History of Worcestershire*, i. p. lxxiiii.

[6] The sixth chapter of the Charter of the Forest prescribed the manner of lawing in the king's forests:

'Talis, autem, sit expeditacio per assisam communiter quod tres ortilli abscidantur sine pelota de pede anteriori.'

in three shillings and a penny. Again in some chases the lords held courts which were called swanimotes. There is a case in the Year Book of 21 and 22 Ed. I. concerning a right of pasture in a wood within the free chase of Whaddon in the county of Buckingham. Counsel, addressing the court on behalf of the lord of the chase, stated that it had been given to an ancestor of the lord by Henry III. to hold as a chase in the same manner as it had been held by the king when it was forest, and that the lord had three swanimotes yearly for searching and inquiring whether anyone put more beasts therein than he ought to put. The actual words [1] of the report are as follows:

Sire, nanyl, me le roy Henry nus le granta e dona a tenyr cum chace aussy cum yl la teint qant ele fut foreyt le roy; e nus avum treis swaynemotes par an pur encercher e enquere sy nuly mette plusurs avers ke metre ne deit.

The lord of a private forest or chase seems also to have been at liberty to appoint verderers to protect his rights. By a charter [2] of the early years of Henry III. John de Vezpont granted to the lords of the manors of Warcop, Sandford, Burton and Hitton, all in the county of Westmoreland, freedom from forester's puture, and from all things that he, his ancestors or heirs or his foresters might or could take or demand at any time by occasion of the said puture by the testimony of the verderers or hunters. It is clear from this charter that the verderers mentioned in it were the officials of the lord of a private forest. Again, the memorandum [3] to which we have already referred shows that there were officers called verderers in the free chase of Malvern, although their duties undoubtedly differed from those of verderers in the king's forests. It is possible, however, that at an earlier date verderers in this chase were engaged in work similar to that of verderers in a forest.

Manwood in his 'Forest Laws' described [4] the buck, the doe, the fox, the marten and the roe as beasts of the chase. But his description is not well founded in law. When the king granted a forest to a subject his rights over the venison or beasts of the forest passed to his grantee. No legal significance was attached to the words 'beasts of the chase.' When they were used they were intended to denote the venison of a chase and not a class of beasts distinct from the beasts of the forest. But although there was no distinction in law between beasts of the

[1] *Year Book*, Rolls Series, 21 and 22 Ed. i. p. 627.

[2] The charter is printed in Nicholson and Burns, *History of Westmoreland and Cumberland*, i. 231.

[3] See p. cx above.

[4] *Forest Lawes*, ed. 1615, cap. 4, p. 39 v°.

forest and beasts of the chase, the various beasts which were hunted were divided into two principal classes by sportsmen. A hunter who lived in the reign of Edward II. and at a later date became known as Twici,[1] wrote a little tract[2] in French on the art of hunting. In it he states that the hart, the wolf, the boar and the hare are hunted in one way, and the buck, the doe, the fox and all other vermin in another. Manwood's classification of beasts of the forest and beasts of the chase was based upon Twici's tract and not upon any consideration of the laws affecting them. The material words of the tract on this subject are as follows :

> Le lefre . . . .; il est enchase, e le cerf ausi est enchace e le lou e le sengler. Et vous, sire veneour, dites moy quantes des bestes sunt aquilliz. Le deym e la deyme e le gopil e la gopille e tote autre vermine. Ore vodroi ioe savoir quantez des bestes sunt meuz de lymer e quanz de bestes sunt trouez de brachez. Sire, touz ceaus qe sunt enchaces, sunt meuz de lymer. E touz ceaus enquillez sunt trovez de brachez.

It is probable, however, that the methods of hunting which were adopted in Twici's day were modified at a later date ; and that in the time of Manwood there was no good reason for his classification, even for purposes of sport.

The word 'chase' was sometimes used in other senses than that of a private forest. Thus in some letters[3] close of 10 January, 122$\frac{6}{7}$ the sheriff is directed to summon those who have enjoyed chase: that is to say, an acquittance or some liberty belonging to forest. At other times it seems to have denoted a portion of the forest in which the inhabitants had no customary right of common. In the Chapters of the Regard of 1229, for instance, regarders[4] are directed to view the king's demesne enclosures and chases where no man has common.

Parks.

The word 'park' was applied to a district of land enclosed with a paling. There is no reason for supposing that it was used exclusively of enclosures made for the purpose of preserving beasts *ferae naturae.*

[1] His real name seems to have been Twiti. On 21 July 1322 the king sent William Twyti into the forests of Thomas, late Earl of Lancaster, to take venison. (Close Roll 147, m. 32.) On 13 March 1328 the king sent a certain person to the abbot of Reading to receive such maintenance in the abbey as William Twiti formerly enjoyed. (Close Roll 154, m. 34 *d.*)

[2] The tract was printed in 1840 at the Middle Hill Press. It was reprinted in 1843 with a preface, translation, and notes by Sir Henry Dryden.

[3] *Rot. Lit. Claus.* ii. 206.

[4] *Royal Letters, Hen. iii.*, Rolls Series, i. 348.

At the present day it is often found as a field name[1] in the west of England, and it is not improbable that a similar usage prevailed in the Middle Ages.

Authority may be cited to prove that the king's licence was necessary before a subject could make a park; but whatever may have been the case in Tudor and Stuart times, no such licence was required in the reigns of the Plantagenet kings, provided that their rights of forest were not infringed. Sometimes, it is true, they granted licences to make parks by letters patent or charter, but it will be found that the royal grants were required because the parks in question were situate either within a forest or in the immediate neighbourhood of one.[2] There are innumerable cases of trespasses in parks lying outside the king's forest mentioned on the Patent Rolls of the reign of Edward I. It would be impossible for licences to have been granted by the king for the enclosure of all these parks without the enrolment of the licences appearing on the Patent Rolls, Charter Rolls, or other records.[3]

[1] So too the word 'imparcare' means to impound or to put in an enclosure. As a general rule, however, 'a park' was used of an enclosure expressly made for deer. In 4 Ed. iii. a respondent answered to a writ of Quo Waranto at Derby as follows:

'Et quod ad alium parcum quem clamat dicit quod ille non est parcus, set est quedam clausura que uocatur Estinker in qua clausura continentur fere etc.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 151.)

Notwithstanding the answer of the respondent to the writ concerning this park he was amerced for his false claim:

'Et quoad predictam clausturam que uocatur Estinker quam clamat ut parcum etc., idem Robertus in misericordia pro falso clamio etc.'

A somewhat similar answer was given at York early in the reign of Ed. i.:

'Et Robertus uenit et dicit quod non clamat habere parcum ibidem; set dicit quod antecessores sui et ipse a tempore conquestus Anglie semper tenuerunt boscum suum inclusum in suo seperali.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 195.)

[2] Thus by letters patent dated 23 February 1335 the king granted Ralph de Neville licence to impark his woods of Middleham and Sheriff Hutton and to make a deer leap in the park of Sheriff Hutton notwithstanding that it was near the forest of Galtres. (Patent Roll 185, m. 34.)

No claims to parks were made before the king's justices in Kent in 6 Ed. ii. This county contained no forests (p. cviii above), but it must have contained many parks. (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, pp. 310 to 368.) There was also no forest in Norfolk, and no claims to parks in that county were made before the king's justices in 14 Ed. i. (*Ibid.* pp. 481–498.) It should also be noticed that in the charter of 18 May 1204, which disafforested all the county of Devon except Dartmoor and Exmoor, the king declared that the men of Devon might make parks outside the metes of the excepted forests. The language of the charter suggests that the king was only granting them a privilege which was enjoyed everywhere outside the royal forests (*Rotuli Chartarum*, 132.)

[3] On the other hand, there certainly are cases in which the owners of parks were called upon to show by what warrant they held them, even when the parks were not situate in or near forests. This happened in 4 Ed. iii. with respect to Wrast (now Wrest) park in Bedfordshire, which is at a considerable distance from a forest. (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 45.) It may be that in these cases the king's advisers set up a claim which could not be justified by precedent. Sometimes, however, a park seems to have been considered as an encroachment upon rights of common. Thus:

'Hugo de Swyllington summonitus fuit ad respondendum domino regi de placito quo waranto appropriauit sibi parcum in le Rodes in loco qui uocatur Indansal' et

The effect of the forest laws was to give the king a certain right of property in the beasts of the forest, which, as we have seen, were described as the king's venison. When he partially disafforested a wood or a piece of land, he frequently reserved his venison by such words as 'salua nobis uenacione nostra.' At other times he would entirely disafforest a district and grant by express words that its owner should be at liberty to make a park of it. In such cases the beasts of the forest, as soon as they entered the park, became beasts *ferae naturae* unprotected by the forest law, and the owner of the park might lawfully kill them for his own use. Every grant of liberty to impark carried with it the obligation of keeping the park properly enclosed, so that the king might not lose his beasts in consequence of his grant.

Outside the forests the owners of neighbouring lands were in the habit of imparking them and making certain contrivances called 'deer leaps' or *saltatoria*, which were of such a nature as to enable the beasts of the forest to enter the park and to prevent them from coming out again. If, however, the deer leap was within a short distance of the forest, it would be presented to the justices in eyre as a nuisance to the forest, and they would then order it to be removed. The precise distance within which a deer leap was considered a nuisance to a forest is a matter of doubt.[1] At the Cumberland forest eyre of 1285, a presentment[2] was made that Isabel of Clifford held a park in which there were two deer leaps, nuisances to the forest, one being a league and the other a league and a half distant from it.

Isabella de Clifford, que est una heredum Roberti de Ueteri ponte defuncti tenet parcum de Qwynnefeld in comitatu Westmerl' ubi sunt duo saltoria[3] ad nocumentum foreste de eo quod unum non distat a foresta domini regis de Inglewod' per unam leucam et aliud distat fere per unam leucam et dimidiam, quorum Iohannes de Ueteri ponte pater Roberti de Ueteri ponte fecit unum et Robertus predictus fecit aliud; et aliud elongauit ad nocumentum foreste domini regis predicte. Et testatum fuit quod

alibi in terris suis in comitatu isto sine licencia et uoluntate domini regis et predecessorum regum Anglie.

'Et Hugo per attornatum suum uenit et dicit quod ipse habet quoddam [*sic*] clausum boscum quod continet quadraginta acras iuxta curiam suam ubi nullus comunicare debet nec comunicauit a tempore quo non extat memoria. Ideo inquiratur de seysina.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 196. See also ibid. p. 339.)

[1] At an inquisition held at Somerton on 21 February 136$\frac{3}{4}$ the forest officers and jurors made the following statement:

'Quod in parco de Cormalet sunt duo saltatoria, qui quidem parcus non distat a dicta foresta tres leucas; et male includitur ad nocumentum ferarum domini regis et contra assisam foreste.' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 309, *Skin* 13.)

[2] *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 5, *Roll* 37 *d.*

[3] The use of the word 'saltoria' instead of 'saltatoria' is exceptional.

tempore predicti Roberti solebant fere domini regis fugari in parcum predictum per saltoria predicta ad magnam destruccionem ferarum domini regis; set post obitum predicti Roberti nullus heredum suorum se de huius modi fuga se intromisit.

By an inquisition[1] held at Kinver in March 133$\frac{2}{3}$, concerning the state of the forest of Kinver, it was found that the prior of Worcester held a park more than two leagues distant from the covert of the forest, in which there was a deer leap to the king's damage.

Et quod prior sancte Marie Wygorn' tenet quemdam parcum, qui uocatur Eymor, qui distat a cooperto foreste predicte per duas leucas et amplius super quo est unum saltatorium per quod fere domini regis in eodem intrare possunt ad dampnum domini regis.

Even if a park which was close to a forest had no deer leap, it would seem that it might be considered a nuisance. In the reign of Edward I. there was a park about a quarter of a league outside the free chase of Malvern. The lord of the chase proceeded against the owner of the park in the court of the king's bench, with the result that the justices, besides ordering the deer leaps in the park to be removed, also ordered the park to be made open.[2] If a park close to a free chase might be considered a nuisance to the chase, a park similarly situate with respect to a royal forest must undoubtedly have been considered a nuisance to the forest.[3] Thus the presentment already mentioned concerning the park of Isabel of Clifford at Whinfell contains a statement that her ancestor had enlarged it to the nuisance of the forest. Probably the objection to a park in the neighbourhood of a forest was that, even if it contained no deer leap, the beasts of the forest might easily find their way into it at points where the paling was out of repair, and might have difficulty in finding their way out again. There would always be a temptation to the owner to entice the king's deer into his park for his own use.[4]

In the early years of the reign of Henry III. deer stealing in parks was not an offence reckoned among the Pleas of the Crown, nor

[1] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 258.

[2] Coram Rege Rolls, No. 124, Roll 50 *d.*

[3] At an inquisition held at Gillingham on 29 June 1366 the following verdict was given:

'Quod parcus principis Wallie de Mere, qui non distat a foresta tres leucas, ita male includitur per quod fere domini regis intrant ad nocumentum foreste.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 298).

[4] In the Essex eyre rolls of 5 Ed. i. the following entry occurs:

'Presentatum est etc. quod parcus episcopi Eliens' qui uocatur Rokhey ita male includitur circumquaque quod pro defectu clausture fere domini regis eum ingrediuntur, et ibidem capiuntur ad magnum damnum domini regis. Et non est ibi uenacio nisi que ingreditur a foresta. Parcus capiatur.' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 12, *Roll* 6.)

was it at any time one which concerned the laws of the forest. It is possible that lords of manors enjoyed lawfully or assumed unlawfully a jurisdiction in this respect. But whether they did so or not, they certainly had no power of punishing trespassers in their parks by imprisonment. At the parliament held on January 23, $123\frac{5}{6}$, when the Provisions of Merton were enacted, the magnates of England are said to have demanded power to imprison malefactors taken in their parks and stews, and the king is said to have refused their demand.[1]

De malefactoribus in parcis et uiuariis non est discussum quia magnates pecierunt propriam prisonam suam de illis, quos ceperant in parcis et uiuariis suis; quod quidem dominus rex contradixit; et ideo differtur.

Ten years later a new law was enacted with respect to trespasses in parks and stews. There is no enrolment of it on the Patent or Close Rolls, but it is recorded in the 'Additamenta' to the 'Chronica Maiora' of Matthew Paris. When an earl, a baron, or a knight complained to the king of deer having been taken in his park, an inquisition was to be held pursuant to a writ from the king, and if anyone was found guilty he was to lie in prison for a year and a day. At the end of that term he was to be ransomed for a sum equal to three years' value of his lands, and he was to find twelve pledges that he would not trespass again in parks, stews, or forests. Two parts of the ransom were to belong to the king, and the remaining third to the owner of the park. When the trespasser was taken suddenly, which no doubt means when he was arrested in the act of trespassing, the punishment was the same, but there appears to have been no need for an inquisition. In this case the king was to have one half the ransom only, and the owner of the park the other half. The law is thus stated by Matthew Paris:[2]

Quomodo puniuntur inuenti malefactores de parcis et uiuariis. Si fugit et occidatur malefactor, non optinebit ius nec appellum; si uero comes, baro, uel miles domino regi conquestus fuerit de bestiis captis in parco suo ita quod per breue domini regis facta fuerit inquisitio, tunc inditatus per inquisitionem et conuictus iacebit in prisona domini regis per unum annum et unum diem et postea redimatur ad pretium ualoris terrarum suarum per tres annos, ita tamen quod interea de suo paupere sustentetur. Et tunc dominus rex habebit duas partes redemptionis, et ille cui transgressus fuerit tertiam. Et post illam redemptionem inueniet duodecim plegios qui ipsum manucapient quod deinceps non malefaciet in parcis uiuariis uel forestis, nec

[1] *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. i. p. 4.
[2] *Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, vol. vi. p. 117.

in aliquo contra pacem domini regis. Et si contingat ipsum in aliquo predictorum malefacere, plegii sui respondebunt de corpore eius et de transgressione. Si uero aliquis subito captus fuerit in parco uel uiuario sine inquisitione facienda per breue domini regis habebit prisonam domini regis ut predictum est, et postea debet redimi modo predicto; et ex illa redemptione habebit dominus rex medietatem et lesus aliam; et postea inueniet duodecim plegios, modo predicto.

This is not the full text of the new law. It contains none of the introductory words which are always found in royal diplomas, and it appears to be rather the description of the law than the material part of its text. Indeed it is at least open to doubt whether the new law ever came into operation. Neither on the plea rolls nor elsewhere is there evidence that recourse was frequently had to its provisions. It is, however, significant that Matthew Paris speaks of it as a law 'cum rigoris incremento,'[1] from which it may be inferred that there had previously been some punishment for the offences against which it was directed. As in all actions for trespass in the king's bench the defendant might, if judgment was given in favour of the plaintiff, be imprisoned, an explanation of the words 'cum rigoris incremento' may be that the second part of the new law was intended to specify a particular degree of punishment in a particular kind of trespass. The enforcement of a law imposing a punishment of this nature would in the thirteenth century in a large measure depend upon the will of the king's justices. In the same way the operation of that part of the new law which related to inquisitions upon trespasses in parks could easily have been defeated by the clerks in Chancery, from whom the writs for holding such inquisitions would be obtained.

Among the Chapters of the Eyre of the latter half of the reign of Henry III. there is an article[2] concerning malefactors in parks and stews. This may have had its origin in the new law of the year 1246, but it is improbable that the king or his advisers intended its enforcement in this way. The language in which the law is described requires either a special inquisition or a procedure by way of action at the suit of the person injured. The Chapters of the Eyre, on the other hand, formed the basis of a procedure by way of presentment.

The next important alteration in the law relating to trespasses in parks and stews was made by the Statutes of Westminster of the year 1275.[3] A plaintiff at whose suit a trespasser was attainted was to be awarded substantial amends, and the trespasser

[1] *Chronica Maiora*, vol. iv. p. 518.

[2] De malefactoribus in parcis et uiuariis, et qui illi fuerunt.' (*Statutes of the Realm*, vol. i. p. 234.)

[3] *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. i. p. 32.

was to be imprisoned for three years, but he might be ransomed at the will of the king if he had wherewith to be ransomed and could find surety that he would not trespass again. If he had not wherewith to be ransomed, he was to stay in prison for three years and then find surety; but if he could not find surety he was to abjure the realm. Fugitives accused of trespass and having no lands by which they might be brought to justice were, after the facts had been found by inquest, to be put in exigent and outlawed. If no one sued within a year and a day after a trespass had been committed, the king was to have the suit. Those who took tame beasts in parks were to be treated as robbers and punished according to the common law. By these statutes the punishment for trespassing in parks was more severe than for similar offences in the forests.[1]

The following is the text of the sections of the statutes which relate to parks:

Purueu est de mefesurs de parkes & de viuers ke, si nul soit ateint par seute le pleintif, soient agardes bones & hautes amendes soulum la manere del trespas, & eint la prison de iij anz & de ilokes soient reinz a la volunte le rey, sil ad dount estre issient reint; & trouesse bone seurete ke mes ne les face; e sil ne ad dount estre reint apres la prison de iij anz trouesse meme la seurete; e sil ne puise trouer la seurete, forsiurge le reaume; & si nul, de ceo rette, soit futif & nen eit terre ne tenement suffisand par quei il puise estre iustice, si tost com le roy auera ceo troue par bone enqueste soit demande de cunte en cunte; & sil ne vient soit vtlage.

E purueu & acorde est ensement ke si nul ne en seut dedenz le an e le iur puis le trespas fet le roy auera la seute & ceus kil trouera rettez de ceo par bone enqueste serrunt puniz par meme la manere en tuz poinz sicom desus est dit. E si nul tel mefesur soit ateint kil eit pris en ceo parks bestes damache ou autre chose en manere de roberie en venand ou en demurrand ou returnand soit fet de luy communne ley ke affiert a cely ki est ateint de aperte roberie & larcin ausi bien a la seute le roy com de autre.

A year later there was a change in procedure. By the law which is known as the 'Statute concerning justices being assigned called Rageman,'[2] it was provided that justices should go throughout the land to inquire, hear, and determine all complaints and suits for trespasses committed within the twenty-five years past, as well by the king's bailiffs and officers as by other bailiffs, and by all other persons whomsoever. They were to inquire, hear, and determine the plaints of those who wished to complain of breaches of the king's

[1] No official enrolment of these statutes exists. The above text is printed from the Harlean MS. 74 (at fo. 94 r°) at the British Museum. This manuscript supplies one of the earliest versions of the statutes. The text in the *Statutes of the Realm* (vol. i. p. 32) is from a later manuscript.

[2] *Statutes of the Realm*, vol. i. p. 44.

statutes, as well concerning the king and the people. In trespasses for which amercement was the penalty, the plea was to be finally determined, and amends were to be made to the plaintiff. In those in which ransom or imprisonment was the penalty, amends were to be forthwith adjudged to the plaintiff, and the trespassers were to be put by good mainprise to be before the king at the parliament next ensuing; if not, they were to abide in prison, and the justices were to inquire of their lands and goods and of the manner of the trespass, and certify the king thereof at the parliament, that he might punish them according to their deserts.

After the date of this statute large numbers of complaints of trespasses were heard and determined by justices specially appointed for the purpose. As the letters patent by which they were appointed were endorsed upon the Patent Rolls, we can obtain a considerable amount of information about the operation of the statute. It was the practice to appoint at least two justices for each case, but the number was sometimes increased to three or even four. They were usually selected from the justices of the two benches and a group of other persons, who were constantly employed at this work but held no permanent judicial office. Among the cases of trespass which they heard a large number related to trespasses in parks and stews. Owners of chases also availed themselves of the provisions of the statute, and commissions to justices to hear and determine complaints of trespasses in chases were constantly issued. It is probable that the jurisdiction of the courts of the chase in trespasses against the venison fell into disuse as these commissions became common.

Although a park was a district enclosed with a paling, while a chase was usually not enclosed at all, the chief distinction between chases and parks is to be found in the laws which were applicable to them. In the chase certain beasts were the property of the lord and were preserved as such by the laws of the forest. These laws were enforced in different degrees in different chases, but nowhere were they part of the ordinary law of the land. The park, on the other hand, was not subject to the forest law. No beasts can be described in law as beasts of the park. The deer which parks contained and for which parks were made, were preserved, not by reason of their being the property of the owner of a park, but because it was a trespass to enter a park for the purpose of taking or hunting beasts *ferae naturae*.

Warren.

It may here be observed that the public had a right of hunting beasts *ferae naturae* in all unenclosed lands, unless the lands were subject to the forest laws or to some restriction upon hunting arising out of a royal grant. Probably the only limit to the right was that it could not be exercised in such a way as to injure property. A direct statement to this effect is not to be found in any of our mediæval treatises on law. But the object of charters of warren and the laws relating to them would be inexplicable if the public had not the right of hunting on unenclosed lands outside forests, chases and warrens.[1]

The word 'Warren' was used to denote either the exclusive right of hunting and taking certain beasts *ferae naturae* in a particular piece of land or the land over which such right extended. William the Conqueror granted[2] that the abbot and monks of Battle should have warren in all places belonging to their monastery. In the twelfth century the kings of England made many grants of warren both to religious bodies and private individuals. Their successors of the thirteenth century, John, Henry III. and Edward I., made lavish grants of the same nature, and by the middle of the fourteenth century it is probable that the majority of lords of manors enjoyed this right in virtue of grants to them or their ancestors.

Throughout the middle ages there was little change in the form of the operative part of a charter of warren. It consisted of three principal clauses. The first was a formal grant of free warren in the demesne lands of the person to whom the charter was granted. The second declared that the grant was subject to a proviso that the lands were not within the metes of the king's forest; and the third prescribed the mode in which the grant was to be enjoyed: namely, in such a way that no person might enter the land to hunt on it or to take anything which belonged to warren without the licence and will of the grantee or his heirs under pain of a forfeiture of ten pounds. The following is an example of a charter[3] of warren of the 21st September 1267.

[1] In 21 Ed. i. certain persons made answer before the king's justices at Newcastle as follows:

'Quod predictus R. habet ibi quendam boscum non inclusum set apertum et in quo nulla fera existit nisi tantum wulpes et lepores etc. Et bene cognoscunt quod ipsi fugauerunt in predicto bosco sicut bene licuit omnibus de patria etc.; et quod ita sit ponunt se super patriam.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 601.)

[2] See Charter Roll, No. 106, m. 25, Entry 56.

[3] The text is from the original charter

Henricus dei gracia rex Angl' dominus Hibern' et dux Aquit' archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, prioribus, comitibus, baronibus, iusticiariis, uicecomitibus, prepositis et omnibus balliuis et fidelibus suis, salutem. Sciatis nos concessisse et hac carta nostra confirmasse dilecto et fideli nostro Roberto de Halyeton' quod ipse et heredes sui habeant imperpetuum liberam warennam in omnibus dominicis terris suis de Haleuthton', Alureston', Offileg', Schebbedon', Hulle, Tunstalle, et le Lee in comitatu Stafford' et in omnibus dominicis terris suis in Withinton', Longenhore, et Cleybur' in comitatu Sallopp', dum tamen terre ille non sint infra metas forreste nostre, ita tamen quod nullus intret terras illas ad fugandum in eis uel ad aliquid capiendum quod ad warennam pertineat sine licencia et uoluntate ipsius Roberti uel heredum suorum super forisfacturam nostram decem librarum. Quare uolumus et firmiter precipimus pro nobis et heredibus nostris quod predictus Robertus et heredes sui habeant imperpetuum liberam warrennam in omnibus dominicis terris suis predictis dum tamen terre ille non sint infra metas forreste nostre ita quod nullus intret terras illas ad fugandum in eis uel ad aliquid capiendum quod ad warennam pertineat sine licencia et uoluntate ipsius Roberti uel heredum suorum super forisfacturam nostram decem librarum sicut predictum est. Hiis testibus Henrico filio Ricardi regis Alem', nepote nostro, Rogero de Clyfford', Rogero de Somery, Willelmo de sancto Omero, Roberto Aguylun, Iohanne de la Lynde, Willelmo de Aete, Radulfo de Bakepuz et aliis. Data per manum nostram apud Sallopp' uicesimo tercio die Septembris anno regni nostri quinquagesimo primo.

The right of warren was not considered to be appurtenant to land. If anyone who had received a grant of warren in his demesne lands assigned the lands to another, the assignee acquired the lands without the warren, because the grant, if in the usual form, had been made to the assignor and his heirs, not to the assignor, his heirs and assigns. Upon such an assignment taking place the lands were liable to be diswarrened. Thus in November 1292 John of Seton was summoned [1] before Hugh of Cressingham and his fellows, justices in eyre at Carlisle, to answer to the king by what warrant he claimed to have free warren in Lamonby. John came and said that King Henry III. had granted to a certain Robert of Haunton, whose assign he was, free warren in all dis demesne lands in Lamonby, and produced a charter in witness thereof. In reply the king's attorney said that as John was not the heir nor of the blood of Robert, he could not claim warren by any charter made to Robert, on the ground that he showed no special deed to him or his ancestors; and he demanded judgment. It was adjudged that John's land in Lamonby should be diswarrened.[2]

at the British Museum, to which the reference is *Add. Ch.* 15773. The charter is also enrolled on Charter Roll 61, m. 3.

[1] *Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 118.

[2] It seems, however, that early in the reign of Ed. i. the king conceded that when he or his ancestors had made a grant of warren the liberty so granted should pass

It was the usual practice for the king to restrict his grants of warren to the demesne lands of his subjects. If anyone appropriated a right of warren over the lands of his free tenants or neighbours he was considered to have abused his franchise and was liable to lose it and be amerced in the king's courts. When landowners were summoned to show by what warrant they claimed free warren in their demesne lands and were able to show a good title, the king's attorneys often raised the further objection that the franchise had been enlarged in this way, and the question was then submitted to a jury.[1] Nor was enlargement the only way in which the right of warren might be abused. It seems that the owner of a warren was obliged to keep a warrener or warden to prevent people hunting in it without his licence; for like other franchises a warren might be forfeited by non-user. Jollan de Neville was summoned [2] before justices in eyre at Nottingham in November 1329 to show by what warrant he claimed free warren in his demesne lands of Rolleston. He produced a charter of Edward I. granting him the right. Thereupon the king's attorney said that he had abused his right. A jury found that he had not guarded his warren and, without even his licence being sought and obtained, had permitted anyone who would to hunt there at his own pleasure. It was then adjudged that Jollan should lose his warren.[3]

The forfeiture of ten pounds to which persons who hunted in warrens without the licence of their owners were liable belonged to the king. In many cases suits were brought in the king's courts by landowners against trespassers in their warrens. When judgment was in favour of the plaintiff, it declared that he should recover his damages against the defendant, and that the king should have his ten pounds of forfeiture. Thus, the finding of the jury and the judgment in a case of trespass in a warren is recorded on the rolls [4] of the King's Bench for Trinity term 1305 as follows:

with the soil of the warren to an assignee. (*Rolls of Parliament*, p. 98.)

[1] At an eyre in Lincolnshire in 9 Ed. i. it was proved that the lord had enlarged his warren, and he was thereupon amerced:

'Et quoad elargacionem warenne dicunt quod ipse [Willelmus] tenet in warennam omnes terras libere tenencium suorum infra dictum manerium. Ideo consideratum est quod decetero non capiat aliquas emendas pro predictis transgressionibus; et quod terre predictorum libere tenencium suorum infra predictum manerium suum sint de cetero extra warennam. Et Willelmus in misericordia.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto* p. 395. See also ibid. pp. 441, 397.)

[2] *Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 618.

[3] At the same eyre other lords lost their warrens through non-user. Thus we have:

'Et quoad warennam in dominicis terris suis in W. dicit quod idem H. non posuit custodem ibi pro illa warenna custodienda set quemlibet pro uoluntate sua permisit in eadem fugare licencia ipsius H. non optenta. Ideo predicta libertas warenne habende in dominicis terris suis de W. capiatur in manum domini regis.' (Ibid. p. 646. See also ibid. p. 639.)

[4] Coram Rege Rolls, 181, Rot. 25 *d*.

Iuratores dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Ricardus predictis die et anno semel tantum intrauit warennam predictam et in eadem fugauit et duos lepores ibidem cepit et asportauit contra uoluntatem ipsius abbatis et contra pacem etc. ad dampnum ipsius abbatis sex denariorum. Ideo consideratum est quod predictus abbas recuperet dampna sua predicta sex denariorum uersus predictum Ricardum; et idem Ricardus capiatur; et dominus rex habeat decem libras de forisfactura etc. secundum statutum etc.

It is not to be understood that whenever it was proved that a trespass had been committed, there was a forfeiture of ten pounds or of any part of that sum. When the suit was brought in the king's court no doubt a forfeiture was incurred. Unless, however, the trespass was serious, it was not tried in the king's court, but in the court of the lord of the warren, or if there were none, perhaps in the hundred or county court. If a trespass were brought before the lord of the warren in the lord's court and the offence was proved, there seems to have been no procedure by way of forfeiture. The king or his officers would have no notice either of the trespass or of its trial. Moreover, trespasses in warrens must have been common offences. If there were forfeitures on conviction in the courts of lords of warrens, some trace of them would be found on the records of the exchequer. On the other hand if the lord had no court, and the proceedings took place in the hundred or county court, it is possible that the forfeiture may have been enforced in them on the king's behalf. If it were enforced, there would not necessarily be any trace of it on the records of the exchequer. The hundred courts in many parts of the country had, at an early date, been granted to subjects who would claim forfeitures for breach of warren as their own property. Hundred courts, when not in the hands of subjects, and county courts were farmed by the sheriffs at a fixed annual sum, and they, too, would make a similar claim. Thus there would be no account rendered at the exchequer of forfeitures for breach of warren, in a suit for trespass in either of these courts.

Another remedy to which the lord of a warren might have recourse for a breach of his franchise was the impounding of the greyhounds, nets or snares of the persons trespassing, and the detention of them until satisfaction had been made for the trespass. It would appear that this method of procedure was a common one, as numerous examples of it are to be found in the Plea Rolls of the royal courts. Thus in 7 Ed. I. the king's attorney alleged[1] that Richard fitz John, who had free warren in his demesne lands of Shere, had

[1] *Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 740.

enwarrened the lands of his free tenants and kept them in defense so that no one could hunt in them without his hounds being taken and detained until he made satisfaction to the same Richard.[1] In all cases where the lord protected his interests in this way there would, in general, be no forfeiture to the king. If a suit to replevy the property taken by the lord were brought in the king's court, the king's officers exacted a forfeiture when due.

It appears that the lord of a warren usually had a court of his own, in which cases of trespass could be determined. Charters of warren seem to have been for the most part granted to lords of manors. It may, indeed, be doubted whether cases of trespass in warrens were ever heard in the courts of the hundred and the county. If the lord had a court of his own, he naturally would not sue in any other court without some good reason. If he had no such court, he would often be the tenant of some other lord who had a court in which he could proceed against trespassers in his warren. Unfortunately, the records of courts of hundreds and counties are rare, and the mere absence of cases relating to warrens in those records of them which we have is not a sufficient basis for a confident statement that the hundred and county courts had no jurisdiction in such cases.

In a few charters of warren it was expressly declared that no person might enter the lands of the grantee to hunt or take the hare and the fox or anything which to warren belonged. But in charters made in the ordinary form no particular kinds of beasts were mentioned. It is abundantly clear, however, that a grant of warren did not enable the grantee to prevent other people entering his warren in pursuit of deer. There was a judicial decision[2] with regard to the buck in Hilary term 128$\frac{7}{8}$. Philip of Willoughby brought an action of trespass in the King's Bench against Thomas the warrener of the abbot of St. Albans. He alleged that Thomas had assaulted his men and seized his hounds and other goods. The defendant answered that the plaintiff's men were hunting in the abbot's warren and that

[1] In 9 Ed. i. the prior of Ravensdale was summoned to answer why he claimed warren in his lands at Ravensdale. The prior came and said that he claimed warren neither there nor elsewhere in the county of Lincoln. Thereupon the king's attorney alleged that the prior had claimed warren and made use of those things which pertained to warren, namely the taking of the greyhounds of his neighbours hunting in the lands: 'Dicit quod qualiterque warennam ibidem ad presens deaduocet in predictis terris, idem prior et predecessores sui hactenus in predictis terris suis warennam clamauerunt et hiis que ad warennam pertinent usi sunt scilicet capiendo leporarios uicinorum suorum in eisdem terris fugancium.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 391. See also ibid. p. 441.)

[2] Coram Rege Rolls, 108, Rot. 35 d.

he took the hounds 'as in the warren of his lord.' The plaintiff replied that his men were in pursuit of a buck in their common chase, where they and all the country could hunt the buck, and demanded that the defendant's lord should come and claim his warren. Afterwards a monk of the abbot came and produced a charter which granted the abbey of St. Albans warren in all its demesne lands in England. Nevertheless, the court declared that the defendant should be in mercy, on the ground that the buck was not a beast of the warren.

Et quia predictus Thomas cognouit predictam capcionem canum et canes predicti Philippi non currerunt ad aliquam bestiam de warenna, immo ad quemdam damum qui non est bestia de warenna, ideo predictus Thomas sit in misericordia.

Again, in the year 1293 William de Colleville, on being summoned [1] before Hugh of Cressingham and his fellows, justices in eyre at York, to answer by what warrant he claimed to have free warren in his demesne lands, produced a charter from Henry III. granting free warren therein to a certain Robert Ingram, ancestor to William. Thereupon Roger of Higham, on behalf of the king, sought that it should be inquired if William was the heir of Robert. He further objected on behalf of the king that William, under the authority of the charter to Robert Ingram, kept large beasts such as harts and hinds, bucks and does, and such like in defense, in the towns in which warren was claimed, and sought that an inquiry should be made as to this and other matters. To other charters of warren produced at the same eyre, he raised a similar objection. From the year 1338, however, the roe was, as explained on an earlier page, considered to be a beast of the warren.[2]

There can be little doubt that the hare was the principal beast of the warren. Not only is it sometimes expressly mentioned in charters of warren, but it forms the subject of by far the greater number of

[1] *Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 203.

[2] Before the decision of the king's bench mentioned on p. xi above, the roe was undoubtedly not considered a beast of the warren. In a case before the king's justices at Appleby in 20 Ed. i. a respondent stated that he did not claim free chase in certain lands but only free warren. The king's attorney thereupon replied that the respondent kept in defense harts, hinds and roes which did not belong to warren:

'Et W. I. dicit pro domino rege quod predictus P. usus est predicta libera chacia et tenet in defenso in eadem ceruos et bissas et cheuerellos cuiusmodi bestie ad warennam non pertinent.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 787. See also *ibid.* p. 789.)

But even before the decision the might be made a beast of the warren in a particular place by royal charter. Thus in 12 Hen. iii. the king granted Peter fitz Herbert warren in certain lands for the fox, the hare and the roe. (Charter Roll 20, m. 7. See also p. xiv above, notes 3 and 4.)

cases of trespass which are recorded upon the plea rolls. Like the hare, the fox is sometimes mentioned in charters of warren.[1] But although foxes do not appear to have given rise to cases of trespass, they were undoubtedly beasts of warren. On the other hand, although the coney is not mentioned in charters of warren, there are cases of trespasses in warrens which show that the coney[2] was considered to be in the same class as the hare and the fox.

Besides beasts there were also fowls of warren. In the Year Book[3] of 21 and 22 Ed. I. the following statement occurs:

> Sire aver chase est proprement a deyms e deymes; e aver gareyne coe est proprement de levers e conyges e perdryz.

This must not, however, be taken as an exhaustive list either of the beasts of the chase or of the beasts and fowls of the warren. For example, the red deer ought to be included in the former and the fox in the latter class. Again, the pheasant was undoubtedly a fowl of the warren, although not mentioned in the list. A special commission of oyer and terminer was appointed[4] in April 1300 concerning a trespass committed by certain persons who entered the free warren of Burgate, hunted in it and carried away hares, coneys and pheasants. Other similar commissions[5] were appointed from time to time to hear and determine trespasses in particular warrens committed by persons carrying away the same beasts and fowls. There is also evidence of other birds being treated as fowls of the warren.[6] It is recorded on a roll of pleas of the warren of Cambridge that divers persons were wont to enter the warren with nets and to take plovers and 'such like wild fowl.' Even more remarkable is the fact that the lark was treated as a fowl of the warren in the manor of Kemerton in Gloucestershire. The case[7] from which this information is derived is sufficiently interesting to be printed in full. It occurs in an eyre of the year 15 Ed. I.:

[1] The mere fact that the fox is sometimes mentioned in charters of warren is not of itself proof that it was considered a beast of warren except in the lands to which the charters relate. The passage printed in note 2, p. cxxxii below shows that the king's attorney in the reign of Ed. i. considered it to be a beast of the warren.

[2] Thus on 28 December 1292 justices were appointed concerning a trespass committed in Benhall warren by persons who took and carried away hares, coneys and partridges. (Patent Roll 111, m. 22 *d.*) See also the case of trespass in Burgate warren mentioned on this page.

[3] *Year Book*, 21 and 22 Ed. i., Rolls Series, p. 529.

[4] Patent Roll 119, m. 22 *d.*

[5] Thus on 20 July 1314 a commission was appointed concerning the persons who entered the warrens of Queen Margaret and took away hares, coneys, pheasants and partridges. (Patent Roll 141, m. 30 *d.*)

[6] See p. 131 below.

[7] *Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 249.

Nicholaus de Mittone queritur de Willelmo de Bello Campo, comite Warwik, de eo quod die Lune proxima post exaltacionem sancte crucis anno regni regis Edwardi nunc quartodecimo, ubi idem Nicholaus possuisset quoddam ingenium quod uocatur tonel in Kenemerton ad alaudas [1] et perdricia capienda predictus comes cepit et capere fecit predictum ingenium iniuste, unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad ualenciam dimidie marce. Et inde profert sectam etc.

Et comes uenit et dicit quod tenet omnes terras in Kenemerton' warennatas et quod non uidetur ei quod debet inde sine breui domini regis respondere. Dicit insuper quod bene aduocat predictam capcionem ut in terris suis warennatis etc.

Et Nicholaus dicit quod predicte terre de Kenemerton' non sunt warennate; set dicit quod ipse et feoffatores sui semper consueuerunt currere et fugare ibidem ut in terris communibus et non warennatis etc. Et hoc petit quod inquiratur per patriam. Et comes similiter. Ideo fiat inde iurata etc.

Et quia conuictum est per quamdam inquisicionem captam inter dominum regem et predictum comitem quod predicte terre de Kenemerton' sunt warennate et sic extiterunt a tempore quo non extat memoria; ideo predictus comes inde sine die. Et predictus Nicholaus in misericordia. Et ad iudicium de predicto Nicholao de decem libris de forisfactura etc.

It will be remembered that the roe was declared to be a beast of the warren on the ground that it drove away the other deer. The reason for the decision and the circumstances in which it was given suggest that the beasts of the warren were noxious animals which, although objects of the chase, ought not to be preserved. There was a marked distinction between the beasts of the forest and the beasts of the warren. The former were strictly preserved by the forest laws, while the latter were in no sense protected by the charters of warren, which merely reserved the right of hunting in them to particular individuals. The beasts of the forest were the king's venison; they were treated as his property, and described as his property. On the other hand, the beasts of the warren were not the lord's beasts, nor were they described as such.[2] We read in the plea rolls of trespassers

[1] In the reign of Richard ii. both the lark and the quail were reckoned as fowls of the warren. On 16 February 1384 the king granted a sporting licence to one of his clerks in the following words:

'Sciatis quod ob affeccionem quam ad dilectum clericum nostrum N. S. gerimus . . . concessimus ei ad totam uitam suam licenciam tam fugandi et interficiendi cum leporariis et aliis canibus ac cum artillariis per se et suos in presencia sua de ceruis bissis damis leporibus et de omni alia fera cum canibus et arcubus fugabili ac de cuniculis cum furettis et alio modo, necnon capiendi uel interficiendi meliori modo quo sciuerit de phasianis perdicibus pluueris quailis alaudis et omnimodis aliis auibus de warenna in forestis chaceis parcis boscis et warennis nostris; ac eciam . . .' (Patent Roll 318, m. 6.)

[2] In a case of trespass in a warren recorded by Mathew Paris the plaintiff refers to the hares which were taken by the defendants as 'his hares': thus, 'et ceperunt lepores suos in warenna sua.' The instance, however, is exceptional. (*Chronica*

entering a warren and hunting in it without the lord's leave; of their taking hares in it; and of the damage which the lord suffered by the trespass. But we do not find the hares described as the property of the lord. The following is a typical example of the record [1] of a case of trespass in a warren.

Idem Iohannes et alii attachiati fuerunt ad respondendum Iohanni de Sutton' de placito quare ui et armis liberam warennam ipsius Iohannis de Sutton' apud Sutton' in Holdernesse intrauerunt et in ea sine licencia et uoluntate eiusdem Iohannis de Sutton' fugauerunt et lepores ceperunt et asportauerunt et alia enormia etc. ad graue dampnum ipsius Iohannis uiginti librarum et unde queritur quod die Sabbati proxima ante festum Annunciacionis beate Marie anno regni regis nunc tricesimo secundo ui et armis liberam warennam ipsius Iohannis apud Sutton' intrauerunt et in ea sine licencia fugauerunt et quinque lepores ceperunt et asportauerunt; unde dicit quod deterioratus est et dampnum habet ad ualenciam centum librarum et inde sectam producit etc.

Et predicti Iohannes de Gray et alii ueniunt et defendunt uim et iniuriam quando etc. Et Iohannes de Gray dicit quod in nullo est culpabilis de transgressione predicta, et de hoc ponit se super patriam.

Et predictus Robertus le Seriaunt et omnes alii dicunt quod ipsi simul cum uxore predicti Iohannis de Gray iuerunt in campis predictis in dominicis terris suis causa ludendi cum leporariis suis. Tandem saltauit unus lepus in dominicis suis predictis; et leporarii sui cucurrerunt ad leporem et secuti fuerunt etc. usque in terram predicti Iohannis de Sutton'. Et super hoc uenit warennarius ipsius Iohannis de Sutton et ipsos deuadiauit et uadium adhuc tenet sine aliqua transgressione eidem Iohanni de Sutton' facienda. Et de hoc ponunt se super patriam.

Et predictus Iohannes de Sutton' dicit quod predictus Iohannes de Gray et alii ui et armis warennam suam apud Sutton' intrauerunt et in ea sine licencia etc. fugauerunt et quinque lepores ceperunt et asportauerunt sicut superius queritur. Et hoc petit quod inquiratur. Ideo ueniat inde iurata coram rege in crastino Purificacionis beate Marie ubicunque etc. quia tam etc.

The view that the beasts of the warren were noxious beasts, which were hunted, but not preserved, is corroborated by another fact. During the twelfth and thirteenth centuries the kings of England frequently granted to individuals the liberty to hunt certain animals in districts in which there were forests. In nearly all cases the king's warrens and the warrens of other individuals were expressly excepted from the districts over which the liberty was to be exercised. Thus,

Maiora, Rolls Series, vol. iv. p. 51.) See also the *Year Book* of 3 Hen. vi. (edition 1679), Trinity Term, fo. 55, case 34.

[1] The case was heard in Michaelmas term 1304. The reference to its enrolment is 'Coram Rege Rolls 178, Rot, 60 *d.*'

by letters patent[1] dated 4 April 1252, Henry III. granted William Gernun licence to hunt the hare, the fox, and the cat throughout the forest of Essex, except in the king's demesne warrens and the warrens of other persons. As no law prevented people from entering warrens in pursuit of beasts which were not beasts of the warren, it may fairly be assumed that the exceptions of the king's warren and the warrens of other persons were made because the animals for which the licence to hunt was given were beasts of the warren. We cannot suppose that the king would derogate from his own grant by conferring an exclusive right of hunting certain beasts in a particular district upon one individual and afterwards granting liberty to another individual to hunt the same beasts in the same district. These licences to hunt usually referred to the fox, the hare, and the cat,[2] but occasionally other animals were mentioned. Thus, on the 25th October 1252 the king granted[3] Walter Baskerville licence to hunt the hare, the fox, the cat and the badger in the forests of Herefordshire, Oxfordshire, Gloucestershire and Essex. There are also instances in which the wolf[4] and even the squirrel[5] were included in such licences.

The fowls of the warren, on the other hand, were certainly not noxious birds. There seems, however, to be no reason for supposing that they consisted of a few easily enumerated species. We have already noticed cases in which the plover and the lark were treated as fowls of the warren. It is not improbable that all birds which were taken by snares, hounds or hawks were considered to belong to the same class.

The creation of every new warren lessened the opportunity which the inhabitants of adjoining lands had enjoyed of hunting at their pleasure. It is therefore not surprising that the large number of charters of warren granted by Henry III. gave rise to a complaint at the parliament of Oxford in 1258. One of the articles[6] of the

[1] Patent Roll 61, m. 10.

[2] There is other authority for the cat being a beast of warren. In 9 Ed. i. the bishop of Salisbury was summoned before the king's justices at Marlborough to show why he claimed warren in Ramsbury. In his reply the king's attorney expressly stated that the fox. the hare and the cat belonged to warren:

'Et W. dicit quod predictus episcopus impediuit homines patrie currere in terra sua apud Remmesbery ad leporem uulpem et murilegum et alia que pertinent ad warennam et deuadiat homines currentes cum canibus suis ibidem et canes illos capit.' (*Placita de Quo Waranto*, p. 804.)

By a charter dated 28 April 1228, the king granted to Roger of Clifford warren in certain lands for the fox, the hare and the cat. (Charter Roll 20, m. 6.)

[3] Patent Roll 61, m. 1.

[4] See p. xiii above.

[5] By letters patent dated 15 January 125$\frac{2}{3}$ the king granted to John of Lexington licence to hunt the fox, the hare, the badger and the squirrel in the forest of Essex. (Patent Roll 62, m. 19.)

[6] *Annales Monastici*, Rolls Series, i. 440.

barons' petition at that parliament is thus set out in the annals of Burton :

> Item petunt remedium quod foreste deafforestate per cartam regis et per fidem eidem per communitatem totius regni factam, ita quod quisque ubique possit fugare, dominus rex de uoluntate sua pluribus dedit de predicta libertate warennas, que sunt ad nocumentum predicte libertatis concesse.

A few additional words are required to make the text of the article grammatical. If these be supplied and no further emendations made it shows that the barons complained that the king had granted warrens in the districts which had been put out of the forest at the beginning of the reign. The barons seem to have considered that the disafforestment of a district implied a pledge that the public should be at liberty to hunt in it at pleasure. But it is not easy to see why the disafforested districts should be in any better position with respect to warrens than lands which had never been afforested. There was certainly no legislation on the subject in consequence of the petition, but it is possible that the king remembered the barons' complaint when applications were made to him for new charters of warren.

The justices of the forest were not concerned with the king's warrens unless they happened to lie within the boundaries of a royal forest. Nevertheless the justices in eyre for pleas of the forest, when sitting at Huntingdon in 13 Edward I., heard pleas[1] of the warren of Cambridge, which was not subject to the forest laws. This, however, was an exceptional case, and no pleas relating to other warrens lying outside the forests are to be found on the forest eyre rolls of the thirteenth century. Evidently the king's rights in such of his warrens as were not parcel of his forests were enforced in the ordinary courts of law. But it is a question whether all the king's demesnes were treated as warrens or not. That he could enwarren his own property at pleasure hardly admits of doubt, seeing that he could create a warren in the demesne lands of any of his subjects. But he may in some cases have refrained from exercising his right; and it is not improbable that the right of hunting beasts of the warren was only reserved by the king in those demesnes where some profit or pleasure was to be obtained by his so doing.

The Year Book of 20 and 21 Edward I. contains a note[2] in

[1] See pp. 129–31, below.
[2] *Year Book*, 20 and 21 Edw. i., Rolls Series, p. 137.

which the procedure to be adopted in cases of trespass in warrens is set out in detail. Trespassers found doing damage in warren with bows, or found with the mainour (that is to say, in possession of hares, coneys, or partridges), or hunting, were to be attached to come before the justices in eyre. The latter words no doubt refer to the justices in eyre for pleas of the crown, and not to justices in eyre for pleas of the forest. The words of the note are as follows:

Nota ke le Roy avera le forfeture de garreine, a ky ke la garreine seit, e nent le seinur de la garreine: e sy le seinur amercye nul home pur coe ke yl est trove en sa garreyne damage fesant, e coe seit presente par la deseine en eyre des Justices, yl serra en la mercye le Roy; mes sy yl trove nul home damage fesant od son arc &c. en sa garreine, yl le fra atacher e trover plegge de venyr devant Justice en eyre a respundre au Roy de le forfet. E si presente seit ke serteyne persone feseient traspas en la garreine, e ke le seynur ne les vodreit pas atacher e prendre plegge de eus, yl sera amercye, e nent les autres ke feseient le tort. E nota ke yl ne put atacher le cors sy yl ne seit trove od meineure coe est saver od leverere, ou conis, partreiz, &c. ou en querant, &c. Sed quaere sy yl porra prendre ses leverres sy eus seient en sa garreyne erranz saunz coe ke yl eient ren pris. Si pount, e prendre plegges a respundre en Eyre des Justices.

But this note, written as it is in the leaves of a Year Book, and not found elsewhere, must be read with suspicion. If it represent the law of the land, and not merely the law as a reporter or advocate thought it ought to be, then the law cannot have been enforced rigorously. There is abundant evidence [1] that lords used to impound the greyhounds of those who trespassed in their warrens. They had recourse to a remedy which was inconsistent with the law as stated in the Year Book, and apparently without any protest or interference on the part of the king or his ministers.

[1] See pp. cxxvi and cxxvii, above.

APPENDIX I.

THE CHARTER OF THE FOREST OF NOVEMBER 1217.

HENRICUS Dei gratia rex Anglie, dominus Hibernie, dux Normannie, Aquitanie et comes Andegauie, archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, prioribus, comitibus, baronibus, iusticiariis, forestariis, uicecomitibus, prepositis, ministris, et omnibus balliuis et fidelibus suis, salutem. Sciatis quod, intuitu Dei et pro salute anime nostre et animarum antecessorum et successorum nostrorum, ad exaltacionem sancte Ecclesie et emendacionem regni nostri, concessimus et hac presenti carta confirmauimus pro nobis et heredibus nostris inperpetuum, de consilio uenerabilis patris nostri domini Gualonis tituli sancti Martini presbiteri cardinalis et apostolice sedis legati, domini Walteri Eboracensis archiepiscopi, Willelmi Londoniensis episcopi, et aliorum episcoporum Anglie, et Willelmi Marescalli comitis Penbrocie, rectoris nostri et regni nostri, et aliorum fidelium comitum et baronum nostrorum Anglie, has libertates subscriptas tenendas in regno nostro Anglie, in perpetuum:

1. Inprimis omnes foreste, quas Henricus rex auus noster afforestauit, uideantur per bonos et legales homines; et si boscum aliquem alium quam suum dominicum afforestauerit ad dampnum illius cuius boscus fuerit, deafforestentur. Et si boscum suum proprium afforestauerit, remaneat foresta, salua communa de herbagio et aliis in eadem foresta illis qui eam prius habere consueuerunt.

2. Homines qui manent extra forestam non ueniant decetero coram iusticiariis nostris de foresta per communes summoniciones, nisi sint in placito, uel plegii alicuius uel aliquorum qui attachiati sunt propter forestam.

3. Omnes autem bosci qui fuerunt afforestati per regem Ricardum auunculum nostrum, uel per regem Iohannem patrem nostrum usque ad primam coronacionem nostram, statim deafforestentur, nisi fuerit dominicus boscus noster.

4. Archiepiscopi, episcopi, abbates, priores, comites et barones et milites et libere tenentes, qui boscos suos habent in forestis, habeant boscos suos sicut eos habuerunt tempore prime coronacionis predicti regis Henrici aui nostri, ita quod quieti sint inperpetuum de omnibus purpresturis, uastis et assartis factis in illis boscis, post illud tempus usque ad principium secundi anni coronacionis nostre. Et qui de cetero uastum, purpresturam, uel assartum sine licencia nostra in illis fecerint, de uastis et assartis respondeant.

5. Reguardores nostri eant per forestas ad faciendum reguardum sicut fieri consueuit tempore prime coronacionis predicti regis Henrici aui nostri, et non aliter.

6. Inquisicio, uel uisus de expeditacione canum existencium in foresta, decetero fiat quando debet fieri reguardum, scilicet de tercio anno in tercium annum ; et tunc fiat per uisum et testimonium legalium hominum et non aliter. Et ille, cuius canis inuentus fuerit tunc non expeditatus, det pro misericordia tres solidos ; et de cetero nullus bos capiatur pro expeditacione. Talis autem sit expeditacio per assisam communiter quod tres ortilli abscidantur sine pelota de pede anteriori ; nec expeditentur canes de cetero, nisi in locis ubi consueuerunt expeditari tempore prime coronacionis regis Henrici aui nostri.

7. Nullus forestarius uel bedellus de cetero faciat scotale, uel colligat garbas, uel auenam, uel bladum aliud, uel agnos, uel porcellos, nec aliquam collectam faciant ; et per uisum et sacramentum duodecim reguardorum quando facient reguardum, tot forestarii ponantur ad forestas custodiendas, quod ad illas custodiendas racionabiliter uiderint sufficere.

8. Nullum suanimotum de cetero teneatur in regno nostro nisi ter in anno ; uidelicet in principio quindecim dierum ante festum sancti Michaelis, quando agistatores conneniunt ad agistandum dominicos boscos nostros ; et circa festum sancti Martini quando agistatores nostri debent recipere pannagium nostrum ; et ad ista duo suanimota conueniant forestarii, uiridarii, et agistatores et nullus alius per districcionem ; et tercium suanimotum teneatur in inicio quindecim dierum ante festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste, pro feonacione bestiarum nostrarum ; et ad istud suanimotum tenendum conueniant forestarii et uiridarii et nulli alii per districcionem. Et preterea singulis quadraginta diebus per totum annum conueniant uiridarii et forestarii ad uidendum attachiamenta de foresta, tam de uiridi, quam de uenacione, per presentacionem ipsorum forestariorum, et coram ipsis attachiatis. Predicta autem suanimota non teneantur nisi in comitatibus in quibus teneri consueuerunt.

9. Unusquisque liber homo agistet boscum suum in foresta pro uoluntate sua et habeat pannagium suum. Concedimus eciam quod unusquisque liber homo possit ducere porcos suos per dominicum boscum nostrum, libere et sine inpedimento, ad agistandum eos in boscis suis propriis, uel alibi ubi uoluerit. Et si porci alicuius liberi hominis una nocte pernoctauerint in foresta nostra, non inde occasionetur ita quod aliquid de suo perdat.

10. Nullus de cetero amittat uitam uel menbra pro uenacione nostra ; set, si aliquis captus fuerit et convictus de capcione uenacionis, grauiter redimatur, si habeat unde redimi possit ; et si non habeat unde redimi possit, iaceat in prisona nostra per unum annum et unum diem ; et, si post unum annum et unum diem plegios inuenire possit, exeat a prisona ; sin autem, abiuret regnum Anglie.

11. Quicunque archiepiscopus, episcopus, comes uel baro transierit per forestam nostram, liceat ei capere unam uel duas bestias per uisum forestarii, si presens fuerit ; sin autem, faciat cornari, ne uideatur furtiue hoc facere.

12. Unusquisque liber homo decetero sine occasione faciat in bosco suo, uel in terra sua quam habeat in foresta, molendinum, uiuarium, stagnum, marleram, fossatum, uel terram arabilem extra cooperatum in terra arabili, ita quod non sit ad nocumentum alicuius uicini.

13. Unusquisque liber homo habeat in boscis suis aereas anciptum et speruariorum et falconum, aquilarum, et de heyrinis, et habeat similiter mel quod inuentum fuerit in boscis suis.

14. Nullus forestarius de cetero, qui non sit forestarius de feudo reddens nobis firmam pro balliua sua, capiat chiminagium aliquod in balliua sua; forestarius autem de feudo firmam nobis reddens pro balliua sua capiat chiminagium, uidelicet, pro careta per dimidium annum duos denarios, et per alium dimidium annum duos denarios, et pro equo qui portat sumagium per dimidium annum unum obolum, et per alium dimidium annum obolum, et non nisi de illis qui de extra balliuam suam, tanquam mercatores, ueniunt per licenciam suam in balliuam suam ad buscam, meremum, corticem uel carbonem emendum, et alias ducendum ad uendendum ubi uoluerint; et de nulla alia careta uel sumagio aliquod chiminagium capiatur; et non capiatur chiminagium nisi in locis illis ubi antiquitus capi solebat et debuit. Illi autem qui portant super dorsum suum buscam, corticem, uel carbonem, ad uendendum, quamuis inde uiuant, nullum de cetero dent chiminagium. De boscis autem aliorum nullum detur chiminagium foristariis nostris, preterquam de dominicis boscis nostris.

15. Omnes utlagati pro foresta tantum a tempore regis Henrici aui nostri usque ad primam coronacionem nostram ueniant ad pacem nostram sine inpedimento et saluos plegios inueniant quod de cetero non forisfaciant nobis de foresta nostra.

16. Nullus castellanus uel alius teneat placita de foresta siue de uiridi siue de uenacione, sed quilibet forestarius de feudo attachiet placita de foresta tam de uiridi quam de uenacione, et ea presentet uiridariis prouinciarum; et, cum irrotulata fuerint et sub sigillis uiridariorum inclusa, presententur capitali forestario cum in partes illas uenerit ad tenendum placita foreste et coram eo terminentur.

17. Has autem libertates de forestis concessimus omnibus, saluis, archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, prioribus, comitibus, baronibus, militibus et aliis tam personis ecclesiasticis quam secularibus, Templariis et Hospitalariis, libertatibus et liberis consuetudinibus in forestis et extra, in warenniis et aliis, quas prius habuerunt. Omnes autem istas consuetudines predictas et libertates, quas concessimus in regno nostro tenendas quantum ad nos pertinet erga nostros, omnes de regno nostro tam clerici quam laici obseruent quantum ad se pertinet erga suos. Quia uero sigillum nondum habuimus, presentem cartam sigillis uenerabilis patris nostri domini Gualonis tituli Sancti Martini presbiteri cardinalis, apostolice sedis legati, et Willelmi Marescalli comitis Penbrok, rectoris nostri et regni nostri, fecimus sigillari. Testibus prenominatis et aliis multis. Data per manus predictorum domini legati et Willelmi Marescalli apud Sanctum Paulum Londonie, sexto die Novembris, anno regni nostri secundo.

APPENDIX II.

ADDITIONAL NOTES.

The Forests.—In the reign of John, the chief barons of the realm were considered to have a certain interest in the royal forests. This is apparent from the following entry [1] on the roll of letters close of the eighth year of his reign :

Rex Brieno de Insula etc. Sciatis quod bene uolumus quod capitales barones nostri, unde nobis mandasti, transeuntes per balliuam uestram feras capiant, set ita quod sciatis qui illi fuerint et quid capiant et quantum, quia non habemus forestas et bestias nostras ad opus nostrum tantum, set eciam ad opus fidelium nostrorum, set bene illas custodire faciatis propter latrones quia bestie magis expauent per latrones quam per predictos barones. . . . Teste me ipso apud Wudestok' undecimo die Iunii.

The right of the barons to take deer on passing through the forests was admitted by the Charter of Forest of 1217.

The Assize of the Forest.—It seems probable that the words 'assize of the forest' meant merely the well-established custom of the forest. In a writ [2] dated 31 December 1222 the king stated that according to the assize of the forest verderers ought not to be put in assizes, juries or recognitions. In another writ,[3] dated 2 October 1224, he stated that according to the law and custom of the forest verderers ought not to be put therein.

The Justices of the Forest.—In the reign of Edward II. the justices of the forest became known as chief wardens. The change is explained by the following words in the New Ordinances [4] of the year 1311 :

Et desormes soit escrit a eux com as chiefs gardeins de la forest, p*ur* ce qe Iustic*es* ne deiuent il estre, ne record auoir forsq*ue* en Eyre.

The Foresters.—Where the working foresters were not paid by the wardens they were said to live upon the country. In 7 Edward I. the following statement was made at an inquisition [5] concerning Gillingham forest :

Et sciendum est quod in predicta foresta consueuerunt esse forestarii, scilicet, unus de feodo propriis sumptibus suis, et adhuc est ; et unus

[1] *Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum*, i. 85.
[2] Ibid. 527 *b.*
[3] Ibid. 648.
[4] *Statutes of the Realm*, i. 161.
[5] *For. Proc., Anc. Chanc., No.* 101, *Roll* 5.

forestarius eques et duo forestarii pedes sumptibus domini regis usque ad ultimam itineracionem Iohannis Byset, iusticiarii domini Henrici regis patris domini Edwardi qui nunc est de foresta. Et post dictam itineracionem uixerunt et adhuc uiuunt super patriam, et colligunt blada et garbas et alia; et faciunt tabernas contra cartam de libertatibus foreste.

It is clear that it was to the advantage of the inhabitants of a forest to have foresters in fee among them. For they usually received certain rights and profits with their bailiwicks, and so had means of living upon the king instead of upon the country. In the first year of John the knights of Staffordshire gave the king forty marks and a palfrey for having their liberties of the forest as they had them in the time of Henry II., so that other foresters might not be put there, unless they were enfeoffed of their bailiwicks.[1]

Eyre Rolls.—There are no eyre rolls at the Public Record Office of an earlier date than 39 Hen. III., except a few fragments of rolls of the year 10 John, most of which are printed in this volume. It will be noticed that the nature and style of the rolls of the reign of John are different from those of the reign of Henry III.

Park.—In the tract known as 'La Court de Baron,' there is a precedent [2] of a case of chasing beasts in the lord's park. In his 'count' the parker alleged that the trespass was made in a franchise which the lord had from the king, to wit, of having the park for his own proper warren as was contained in the charter which he had from the king, whereby it was forbidden on pain of forfeiture of 10*l.* that any should enter to chase or take beasts unless by the lord's leave. These words suggest that it was usual for the king to grant charters of imparkment with a penal clause similar to the one invariably inserted in charters of warren. The Charter Rolls show that this was not the case, and it is therefore probable that the words which are the subject of this note, if they are part of the tract as originally written, are erroneous.

Warren.—In an unprinted Year Book, which will be published in due course by the Selden Society, there is a case which seems to show that in the reign of Edward II., the lord might amerce trespassers in his warren, provided that the amount of the amercement did not exceed the value of the beast taken by the trespasser. The case is one which was heard in the Kent eyre for pleas of the crown and common pleas in 6 Ed. II.

[1] *Rotuli de Oblatis*, p. 65.
[2] Publications of the Selden Society, vol. iv. p. 33.

SELECT PLEAS OF THE FOREST

I.[1]

PLACITA FORESTE PLACITATA APUD NORHAMTON' DIE[2] VENERIS PROXIMA ANTE FESTUM SANCTI MATHIE APOSTOLI ANNO REGNI REGIS IOHANNIS DECIMO.

cras. misericordia.

Robertus de Acle in misericordia quia non habuit Godwinum forestarium suum quem plegiauit; et habeat eum die crastina.

cras. misericordia.

Elia de Karleton' [et Aluredus de Dingel'[3]] in misericordia quia non habuerunt capud cerui eis[4] commissum; et habeat die crastina.

v s. misericordia.

Robertus de Riston' et tethinga Ricardi fratris sui in misericordia pro fuga predicti Ricardi. Catalla ipsius Ricardi quinque solidi, vnde Rogerus de Neuill' debet respondere.

misericordia. iij s. vj d.

Thethinga Henrici Trenchenote de Riston' in misericordia pro fuga ipsius Henrici; precium catallorum tres solidi sex denarii, vnde idem Rogerus debet respondere. Idem Henricus est interrogandus.

misericordia.

Thethinga Wioti [et Ricardi Sprang hominis Ricardi fratris Roberti de Riston][5] in misericordia pro fuga ipsius Wioti. Non habuit catalla; et est interrogandus.

misericordia.

Francoplegii Willelmi Warin' hominis Iohannis Basset in misericordia pro fuga ipsius Willelmi.

vtlag'.

Vicecomes debet respondere die crastina de predictis Ricardo, Henrico, Ricardo Sprang et Wiot si fuerint vtlagati. Et vicecomes dicit[6] quod vtlagati sunt.[7]

Coram rege.

Rogerus Grim messarius abbatis de Burgo captus fuit sequendo

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 62. There is also at the Public Record Office an official transcript of this roll which was made towards the close of the thirteenth century. The reference to it is *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 249, *Rot.* 16. [2] 20 February 120$\frac{8}{9}$.

[3] The words in brackets are cancelled in the original roll and omitted in the transcript.

[4] The last letter of this word has been erased in the original roll. It is omitted in the transcript.

[5] The words in brackets are interlined in the original roll and omitted in the transcript.

[6] This word is repeated in the original roll.

[7] The following entry is here written in the original roll and cancelled. It is omitted entirely in the transcript. 'Rogerus Grim messarius abbatis de Burgo traditus fuit in custodia Gaufridi Gilbewin' ut senescalli abbatis, qui non habuit eum coram iusticiariis; et ideo est in misericordia; et habeat eum ad alium diem, ita recordatur comitatus.'

I.

PLEAS OF THE FOREST PLEADED AT NORTHAMPTON ON THE FRIDAY[2] NEXT BEFORE THE FEAST OF SAINT MATHIAS THE APOSTLE IN THE TENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING JOHN.

Robert of Oakley is in mercy because he had not Godwin his forester, whom he pledged; and let him have him to-morrow.

Elias of Carlton is in mercy because he had not the hart's head which was entrusted to him; and let him have it to-morrow.

Robert of Rushton and the tithing of Richard his brother are in mercy for the flight of the aforesaid Richard. The chattels of the same Richard are five shillings, wherefor Roger de Neville must answer.

The tithing of Henry Trenchnot of Rushton is in mercy for the flight of the same Henry; the price of his chattels was three shillings and sixpence, wherefor the same Roger must answer. The same Henry is to be exacted.

The tithing of Wiot is in mercy for the flight of the same Wiot. He had no chattels; and he is to be exacted; and similarly the tithing of Richard Sprang the man of Richard the brother of Robert of Rushton.

The frankpledges of William Warin the man of John Basset are in mercy for the flight of the same William.

The sheriff must answer to-morrow as to the aforesaid Richard, Henry, Richard Sprang and Wiot, if they were outlawed. And the sheriff says they were outlawed.

Roger Grim, the reaper of the abbot of Peterborough, was taken

cum canibus quatuor bissas. Et traditus fuit in custodia magistri Gaufridi Gilbewin' ut senescalli abbatis de Burgo. Et non habuit illum coram iusticiariis. Iudicium comitatus quod idem Gaufridus Gilbewin' sit in misericordia quia non habuit predictum Rogerum; et custod'. cras. remaneat in prisona; et liberatur vicecomiti custodiendus.

miseri-cordia. Simon Vicor de Norhamton' in misericordia pro stultiloquio. Terra Petri Tanet scilicet sex acre, quas habuit de capellano de Vfford' in manu regis. saisiatur in manu regis.

interrog'. Idem Petrus et Ricardus Gerewold' interrogandi sunt, qui visi fuerunt in foresta cum arcubus et sagittis in bersa. Non habuerunt catalla. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod illos exigat secundum assisam in comitatu; et si non uenerint vtlagantur.[1]

miseri-cordia. Robertus de Vfford' clericus et villata comuniter[2] in misericordia pro fuga predictorum Petri et Ricardi.

iij s. De villata de Witering' tres solidi quia non habuerunt quod plegiauerunt.

Samuel filius Iacobi de Norhamt' inueniat plegios habendi warantum suum de vno damo quem habuit apud Bernak' die Veneris[3] proxima ante mediam quadragesimam. Plegius eius Samuel filius Deodati. (apud Bernak.)

Bernek'. prison'. Willelmus filius Simonis de Barton' liberatur in prisona quia conuictus fuit quod falso et per odium imposuit super Stephanum de Pinu clericum quod in domo sua debuerat commedisse duos feones vnde respondebit de catallis suis apud Bernek'.

xx s. Robertus del Toc in misericordia quia non habuit viginti solidos de precio trium equorum, quod plegiauit, qui fuerunt Gaufridi persone de Quappelad'; et respondebit de predictis viginti solidis.[4]

iij marce. Robertus de Neuill' clericus respondebit de precio trium equorum Petri de Paris clerici, scilicet, de tribus marcis pro arcu inuento in societate ipsius Petri.

miseri-cordia. Adam de Crumle in misericordia quia non habuit Radulfum filium Simonis de Noua Landa in Wirecestresir' coram iusticiariis, qui tulit arcum cum corda et vna sagitta barbata et vna bulsone. Et habeat eum ad alia placita. Postea finem fecit pro quietancia pleuine.

miseri-cordia. Radulfus filius Hugonis de Chaucumb' et Hugo de Bereford' in misericordia quia non habuerunt Walterum de Ringesdun', quem

[1] 'Vtlagentur' is intended.

[2] The true reading of this word is doubtful. It is entirely omitted in the transcript. The word 'comuniter' is similarly used in *The Great Roll of the Pipe of* 1 *Ric. I.* published by the Record Commissioners in 1844, at p. 184.

[3] 6 March 120$\frac{8}{9}$.

[4] Geoffrey's horses had been forfeited to the king and sold. The purchase money was then handed over to Robert del Toc to be produced at the next eyre.

as he followed with his dogs four hinds. And he was delivered into the custody of master Geoffrey Gilbewin as the steward of the abbot of Peterborough ; and he had him not before the justices. Judgment of the county :—that the same Geoffrey be in mercy because he had not the aforesaid Roger ; and that he remain in prison, and he is delivered to the sheriff in custody.

Simon Vicor of Northampton is in mercy for contemptuous speech.

Let the land of Peter Tanet, to wit, the six acres which he had of the chaplain of Ufford, be seized into the king's hands.

The same Peter and Richard Gerewold are to be exacted. They were seen in the forest with bows and arrows within an enclosure. They had no chattels. And the sheriff is ordered that he exact them according to the assize in the county ; and if they do not come, let them be outlawed.

Robert of Ufford, clerk, and his whole township are in mercy for the flight of the aforesaid Peter and Richard.

Of the township of Wittering three shillings, because they had not what they pledged.

Let Samuel the son of James of Northampton find pledges of having his warrant of one buck, which he had at Barnack, on the Friday [3] next before the middle of Lent. His pledge is Samuel the son of Deudon.

William the son of Simon of Barton is delivered into custody, because it was proved that falsely and through hatred he imputed to Stephen de Pin, clerk, that he had feasted upon two fawns, wherefor he will answer with his chattels at Barnack.

Robert del Toc is in mercy because he had not twenty shillings, the price which he pledged of three horses which were the property of Geoffrey the parson of Whaplode. And he will answer for the twenty shillings aforesaid.

Robert de Neville, clerk, will answer for the price of three horses of Peter de Paris, clerk, that is to say for three marks for a bow found in the company of the same Peter.

Adam of Crumlegh is in mercy because he had not before the justices Ralph the son of Simon of Newland in Worcestershire, who carried a bow with a string and a barbed arrow and a bolt. And let him have him at the next pleas.

Afterwards he made fine for an acquittance from his suretyship.

Ralph the son of Hugh of Chalcombe and Hugh of Barford are in mercy because they had not Walter of Ringsdon, whom they pledged,

plegiauerunt, captum cum arcu et corda in foresta. Et dictum est quod mortuus est. Iohannes filius Gerard' et Willelmus de Chaucumb' in misericordia quia fecerunt se plegios predicti Walteri et non fuerunt.

miseri-cordia. Villata de Neweton' comuniter [1] in misericordia pro fuga Ricardi Gelee messarii sui retati de damo bersato in curto bosco de Nassinton pro quo Henricus filius Benselin' de Neweton' captus fuit.

memorandum. Forestarii inuenerunt in bosco de Nassinton' vnam damam habentem gorgiam abscisam et prope inde inuenerunt Henricum filium Bence latentem sub quodam bussone; et ipsum ceperunt et in prisonam posuerunt. Idem venit coram iusticiariis et defendit quod de dama illa nunquam aliquid sciuit, nisi tantum quod ibat in bosco illo ad querendum equm suum. Forestarii illum ceperunt et duxerunt usque ad damam [2] illam. Forestarii et viridarii, requisiti si ipse culpabilis sit inde uel non, dicunt quod non credunt quod ipse culpabilis sit, set credunt melius quod Ricardus Gelee messarius de Neweton' sit inde culpabilis quoniam fugiit quamcito audiuit quod predictus Henricus captus fuit. Et quoniam ipse Henricus cruce signatus fuit et non malecreditur et diu iacuit in carcere, concessum est ei quod ipse faciat peregrinacionem suam. Et moueat ante Pentecosten, et si redierit et possit plegios inuenire de fidelitate, maneat in foresta.

peregrinacio.

mortuus in prisona. Thomas Inkel, forestarius de Cliue, inuenit in bosco de Siberton' quandam placiam sanguinolentam; et traciauit [3] sanguinem in niue usque domum Radulfi Red de Siberton' et statim mandauit viridarios et probos homines. Cerchiauerunt domum suam et in ea inuenerunt carnem cuiusdam dame et ipsum Radulfum ceperunt et posuerunt in prisona apud Norhamt', in qua obiit, set ante obitum suum quando fuit in prisona appellauit Robertum Sturdi de Siberton' et Rogerum Tocke de eadem quod simul cum eo fuerunt malefactores de foresta. Et forestarii et viridarii scrutati sunt domum predicti Roberti, et in ea inuenerunt ossamenta ferarum et ipsum ceperunt et in prisona miserunt. Et in domo Rogeri Tocke inuenerunt aures et ossamenta ferarum. Et idem captus fuit et inprisonatus. Robertus Sturdi uenit coram iusticiariis et dicit quod canes Walteri de Preston' solebant iacere in domo sua. Venacionem manducauerunt uenatores sui vnde illa ossamenta fuerunt et inde uocat warantum predictum Walterum, et habeat eum die crastina. Venit Walterus et warantizat

[cras] de waranto.

[1] See p. 2, *n*. 2.

[2] In place of this and the following word both texts have 'domum illum,' which seems to be a clerical error. In the previous entry the same beast is described as a buck.

[3] This word is so written in the transcript. In the original roll it might be read as 'trazauit.'

who was taken with a bow and a string in the forest. And it is said that he is dead. John the son of Gerard and William of Chalcombe are in mercy because they represented themselves to be pledges of the aforesaid Walter; and they were not.

The whole township of Newton is in mercy for the flight of Richard Gelee, their reaper, who was accused of a buck shot in the short wood of Nassington, for which Henry the son of Benselin of Newton was taken.

The foresters found in the wood of Nassington a doe with its throat cut, and hard by they found Henry the son of Benselin lying under a certain bush. And they took him and put him in prison. He comes before the justices and denies that he ever knew anything of that doe, except only that he went into that wood to seek his horse. The foresters took him and led him to that doe. The foresters and verderers, being asked if he were guilty thereof or not, say that they do not think that he was guilty, but they believe rather that Richard Gelee the reaper of Newton is guilty thereof, because he fled as soon as he heard that the aforesaid Henry was taken. And because Henry himself has taken the cross, and is not suspected, and has lain for a long time in prison, it is granted to him that he may make his pilgrimage; and let him start before Whitsunday; and if he return, and can find pledges of his fealty, let him remain in the forest.

Thomas Inkel, forester of Cliffe, found in the wood of Siberton a certain place wet with blood, and he traced the blood in the snow as far as the house of Ralph Red of Siberton; and forthwith he sent for the verderers and good men. They searched his house, and in it they found the flesh of a certain doe; and they took Ralph himself and put him in prison at Northampton, where he died. But before his death, when he was in prison, he appealed Robert Sturdi of Siberton and Roger Tock of the same town, because they were evil doers to the forest together with him. And the foresters and verderers searched the house of the aforesaid Robert, and in it found the bones of deer; and they took him and sent him to prison. And in the house of Roger Tock they found ears and bones of wild beasts. And he was taken and imprisoned. Robert Sturdi comes before the justices and says that the dogs of Walter of Preston used to be kenneled at his house. Walter's hunters ate the venison whence came the bones; and Robert vouches the aforesaid Walter to warranty of this; and let him have him to-morrow.

eum dicens quod canes sui iacuerunt in domo eius per quindecim dies dum currebant ad damos.

maneat extra forestam. Predictus Rogerus Tocke uenit coram iusticiariis et totum defendit. Et viridarii et forestarii testantur quod aures et ossamenta inuenta in domo sua fuerunt de bestiis quos venatores W. de Preston' ceperunt. Et quoniam idem Rogerus diu iacuit in prisona ita quod fere mortuus est, adiudicatum est quod eat quietus; et maneat extra forestam.

misericordia. Willelmus filius Radulfi de Weston' in misericordia pro falsa presentacione.

misericordia. Robertus de Hale et Willelmus de Suwic' viridarii in misericordia quia non habuerunt ossamenta eis commissa.

misericordia. Ricardus Engan' ponit se in misericordia ante iudicium pro dicto suo.

Ricardus filius Willelmi de Baseuill' de Ketene captus fuit in parco de Cliue, ferens vnam cutem dami recentem, per Gaufridum hominem Rogeri Blundi, cui cognouit, ut idem G. dicit, quod corium illud inuenit; et ductus fuit apud Rokingeh' et inprisonatus. Et idem Ricardus uenit coram iusticiariis et dicit quod corium illud emit apud Kenebauton' de quodam garcione ignoto; et mittitur apud Rokingeh' in prisona ad inquirendum ad placita de Roteland die Lune[1] proxima ante mediam quadragesimam apud Okham'. Postea finiuit per viginti solidos ut quietus sit [quin][2] inquisi[tum sit] quod illud corium emit apud Kenebalton', Mauricio de Andel' plegio denariorum.

Quidam ceruus inuentus fuit mortuus in curia Willelmi de Trumpinton' uulneratus, quem Baldewinus prepositus eiusdem Willelmi custodiuit [in][2] Asseby. Et habuit vnam perticham fractam usque ad cerebrum. Et quatuor villate propinquiores summonite, requisite nichil sciunt dicere de [facto][2] illo. Et quia perticha fracta fuit usque ad cerebrum, creditur quod per Willelmum magis quam per

in manu regis. alios interfectus erat; et ideo [seisita est villa]ta[2] in manu regis et inquiratur.

Capud cuiusdam cerui recens inuentum fuit in bosco Henrici de Alneto apud Maideford' per forestarios regis. Et forestarius predicti Henrici mortuus est. Et quia nichil potest inquiri de ceruo illo, pre-

in manu regis. ceptum est quod tota predicta uilla de Maideford' saisita sit in manu regis cum bosco pertinente [ad][2] eandem uillam desicut predictus Henricus nichil scit de ceruo illo certificare.

[1] 2 March $120\frac{8}{9}$.

[2] Words and letters in square brackets are taken from the transcript, the original roll being damaged.

Walter comes and warrants him, saying that his dogs were kenneled in his house for fifteen days while he was hunting bucks.

The aforesaid Roger Tock comes before the justices and denies everything. And the verderers and foresters witness that the ears and bones found in his house were those of beasts which the hunters of Walter of Preston took. And because Roger lay for a long time in prison, so that he is nearly dead it is adjudged that he go quit; and let him dwell outside the forest.

William the son of Ralph of Weston is in mercy for a false presentment.

Robert of Hale and William of Southwick, the verderers, are in mercy because they had not the bones which were entrusted to them.

Richard Engayn puts himself in mercy before judgment for his statement.

Richard the son of William de Baseville of Ketton was taken in the park of Cliffe, carrying one fresh skin of a buck, by Geoffrey the man of Roger Blund, to whom he confessed, as the same Geoffrey says, that he found that skin. And he was taken to Rockingham and imprisoned. And Richard comes before the justices and says that he bought that skin at Kimbolton from a certain unknown boy. And he is sent to prison at Rockingham for inquiries to be made at the pleas of Rutland on the Monday [1] next before Mid-Lent at Oakham. Afterwards he made fine by twenty shillings that he might be quit of the inquiry whether he bought that skin at Kimbolton, Maurice Daundelay being pledge of his pence.

A certain hart was found dead and wounded in the court of William of Trumpington, of which Baldwin the reeve of the same William took charge in Ashby. And it had one antler fractured as far as the brain. And four neighbouring townships being summoned and questioned say they know nothing of the deed. And because the antler was fractured as far as the brain, it is believed that it was killed by William rather than by any other person; and therefore let his township be seized into the king's hand, and let inquiry be made.

The head of a hart recently dead was found in the wood of Henry Dawney at Maidford by the king's foresters. And the forester of the aforesaid Henry is dead. And because nothing can be ascertained of that hart, it is ordered that the whole of the aforesaid town of Maidford be seized into the king's hand with the wood belonging to the same town, on the ground that the aforesaid Henry can certify nothing of that hart.

Villata de Merston' Prioris de Weneloc in Warwiksir' in misericordia quia non leuauerunt clamorem super malefactores regis, scilicet, super Elyam Hor[stail][1] de eadem et Randulfum le Meser de Herdewik'. Uisi fuerunt ab hominibus de Botintun', ubi occiderunt vnam bissam in campo de Botintun'. Et fugerunt et euaserunt de hominibus illis. Et interrogandi sunt per comitatum. *interrog.'*

miseri-cordia. Robertus Walen' seruiens comitis de Wint' in Bukebi in misericordia quia non habuit coram iusticiariis duos brachettos comitis tesantes vnum ceruum usque in forestam, quos recepit habendi[2] coram iusticiariis et non habuit.

miseri-cordia. Villata de Snokescumb' in misericordia comuniter, quia fecerunt Nicholaum messarium, qui fugitiuus est. Et captus fuit et inprisonatus; et postea euasit de prisona; [et interrogandus[3] per comitatum]. *inter-rogand'.*

miseri-cordia. Thomas filius Eustach' et Thomas de Albo Monasterio in misericordia, quia portauerunt arcus et sagittas in foresta regis sine licencia; et monstrandum est regi. *coram rege.*

miseri-cordia. Henricus de Stauerton' in misericordia quia conuictus est de mendacio.

Canes comitis Dauid capti fuerunt in foresta super vnum damum per forestarium. Et per dictum forestarium dimissus sub pleuina Willelmo Grimbald' et Simoni de Hocton' habendi coram iusticiariis. Willelmus venit et defendit pleuinam illam. Et ideo adiudicatum est ei vt defendat se secundum assisam foreste. Et Simon veniet cras. Postea uenit predictus Willelmus Grimbald' coram iusticiariis et posuit se in misericordia. *cras.*

Villata de Brechol' in misericordia quia non habuerunt quem plegiauerunt.

Radulphus Neirnut de Threwelton'[4] in misericordia quia balista et arcus inuenta fuerunt in domo sua sine waranto.

Rogerus Wandard in misericordia pro leporaria habita contra assisam.

Hii sunt qui fuerunt ad retinendum Willelmum[5] viridarium apud Norhamt', Johannes Samson prepositus Norhamt', Petrus Preston', Emeraud[6] Destreis, Willelmus filius Pagan', Gaufridus Ruffus de Farding, Restwald Ca.

[1] Words and letters in square brackets are taken from the transcript, the original roll being damaged.

[2] This word is so extended in both texts.

[3] The reading in the transcript is 'interrogat,' which is probably an error.

[4] This word is clearly written in both texts, but perhaps Chrewelton' is intended.

[5] This is probably the William of Southwick mentioned on p. 4.

[6] The reading of this name is doubtful.

The prior of Wenlock's township of Marston in Warwickshire is in mercy because they did not raise the hue and cry on evil doers to the king, that is to say upon Elias Horstail of the same town and Ranulph the reaper of Hardwick. They were seen by the men of Bodington, where they killed a hind in the field of Bodington; and they fled and escaped from those men; and they are to be exacted by the county.

Robert the Welshman the servant of the earl of Winchester in Buckby is in mercy because he had not before the justices two braches of the earl which worried a hart into the forest; and he received them to have before the justices; and he had them not.

The whole township of Snorscomb is in mercy because they made Nicholas, who is a fugitive, their reaper. And he was taken and imprisoned; and afterwards escaped from prison. And he is to be exacted by the county.

Thomas the son of Eustace and Thomas of Oswestry are in mercy because they carried bows and arrows in the king's forest without licence; and the matter must be shown to the king.

Henry of Staverton is in mercy because he is convicted of falsehood.

The dogs of Earl David were taken in the forest upon a buck by the forester. And by the said forester he was put on pledge to William Grimbald and Simon of Houghton, to have them before the justices. William comes and denies that pledge, and therefore it is adjudged that he defend himself according to the assize of the forest. And Simon will come to-morrow. Afterwards the aforesaid Grimbald came before the justices, and put himself in mercy.

The township of Brockhall is in mercy because they had not him whom they pledged.

Ralph Neirnut of Threwelton is in mercy because a crossbow and a bow were found in his house without warrant.

Roger Wandard is in mercy for a greyhound bitch which he had against the assize.

These are the persons who were to keep William the verderer at Northampton, John Samson, the reeve of Northampton, Peter Preston, Emerald Destreis, William the son of Pain, Geoffrey Red of Farding, and Restwald Ca.

coram rege. Gaufridus filius Petri agistauit vno anno ducentos porcos et alio anno centum et quinque porcos.

Henricus de Alneto duas marcas pro habendo bosco suo in pace capto in manu regis.

II.[1]

PLACITA VENACIONIS PLACITATA APUD OCHAM IN ROTEL' DIE MARTIS[2] PROXIMA ANTE MEDIAM QUADRAGESIMAM ANNO REGNI REGIS IOHANNIS DECIMO.

Radulfus de Martiwast dat viginti marcas ut quietus sit de eo quod filius suus inuentus fuit in chimino magno in foresta cum arcu sine corda.[3]

Regardores Rotel' et Leyc' communiter in misericordia quia non fecerunt quod facere debuerunt.

Veredictum militum comitatus Rotel' quod ad summonicionem iusticiariorum de foresta venire debent ad placita foreste omnes de comitatu Leic' comuniter qui manent extra forestam ad distanciam duarum leucarum.

Viscera cuiusdam cerui inuenta fuerunt subtus molendinum Roberti filii Ade de Skeftindon', et perticha similiter. Et erat vna percussura in perticha, ac si esset facta de quadam securi. Et molendinarius scilicet Willelmus Alani requisitus de ceruo illo dixit quod nichil scit. Et quia molendinum erat ita remotum,[4] a villa et prope choopertum foreste, preceptum est quod molendinum capiatur in manus regis, et molendinarius remaneat in custodia hominis Nicholai de Verdoun de Skegenton' ad inquirendum.

Elias de Lutterwrthe in misericordia pro stultiloquio facto coram iusticiariis.

In domo Henrici filii Lefsi inuentus fuit [p*re*ap*us*][5] vnius cerui. Et interrogatus vnde uenerat hoc dixit quod venatores regis illum ei

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 249, Roll 11. This is an official transcript made towards the close of the thirteenth century. The original no longer exists.

[2] 3 March $120\frac{8}{9}$.

[3] It is difficult to see the reason for the insertion of the words 'sine corda.' A man might pass through the forest with a bow and arrows provided that he bound the arrows to the bow with the string. Perhaps the absence of the string raised a suspicion of its being used as a snare.

[4] MS. 'remotus.'

[5] This word was probably wrongly transcribed from the original roll. The letters here printed in italics represent contractions in the roll. Perhaps the word in the original was 'perticha' or 'perchia.'

Geoffrey fitz Peter agisted in one year two hundred pigs and in another year one hundred and five pigs.

Henry Dauney gives two marks for having in peace his wood which was taken into the king's hand.

II.

PLEAS OF THE VENISON PLEADED AT OAKHAM IN RUTLAND ON THE TUESDAY[2] NEXT BEFORE THE MIDDLE OF LENT IN THE TENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING JOHN.

Ralph de Martinvast gives twenty marks that he may be quit of this, that his son was found in the high road in the forest with a bow without a string.

The regarders of Rutland and Leicester are all in mercy because they did not that which they ought.

The verdict of the knights of the county of Rutland is that at the summons of the justices of the forest all men of the county of Leicester ought to come to the pleas of the forest who dwell outside the forest as far as two leagues.

The entrails of a certain hart were found under the mill of Robert the son of Adam of Skeffington; and an antler likewise. And there was a fracture in the antler as though it were made with a certain axe. And the miller, that is to say William the son of Alan, being asked about that hart, said that he knows nothing. And because the mill was so far away from the town and near to the covert of the forest, it is ordered that the mill be taken into the king's hands; and that the miller remain in the custody of the man of Nicholas of Skeffington for inquiries to be made.

Elias of Lutterworth is in mercy for contemptuous speech before the justices.

In the house of Henry the son of Lefsi there was found the [antler] of a hart; and being asked whence it came he said that the king's

dederunt. Et forestarii dubitauerunt quod ille ceruum asportauerat quem rex interfecit in foresta, et fuit deperditus.

Et inquisicio facta coram iusticiariis quod non malecreditur de ceruo illo; et ideo remanet in custodia villate de Skeftinton' ad inquirendum. Et Willelmus filius Gunnild' manet in custodia Iohannis filii Simonis domini sui ad inquirendum, qui visus fuit prout dicebatur prope locum vbi predictus ceruus interfectus fuit. Et debent reddi a Pascha anno regni regis Iohannis decimo infra annum completum.

Robertus de Langeton' et Robertus Sampson, viridarii Leic', in misericordia quia contradixerunt scripto suo.

Michael de Neuill' et Robertus de Wiuill' viridarii in misericordia quia non fecerunt quod facere debuerunt; et Hugo forestarius et Samuel socius eius in misericordia pro eodem.

Rogerus filius Petri de Vppingham in misericordia pro stulto facto.

Thomas de Hotot, Willelmus de Fraxino et Henricus de Vppingham, Alexander de Martinesthorp', viridarii, in misericordia quia fecerunt quod facere non debuerunt.

Villata de Ocham in misericordia quia non habuerunt Robertum seruientem comitis Heref' quem plegiauerunt.

Villata de Egildun' in misericordia quia non venerunt coram iusticiariis sicut venire debuerunt.[1]

Villata de Cnossinton' in misericordia quia non habuerunt quos plegiauerunt, scilicet, Ricardum et Willelmum, qui inuenti fuerunt cum arcubus et sagittis in chimino versus Rokingh'.

Benedictus de Haueresham offert dimidiam marcam domino regi pro habendo bosco suo capto in manu regis; et inquirendum [per quem].

Rogerus Monachus offert domino regi dimidiam marcam pro eodem.

Vicecomes Rotel' in misericordia quia [non] habuit prisones qui liberati fuerunt ei in custodia per manus forestariorum.

Memorandum quod boscus Reginaldi de Wittok' capiendus est in manu regis.

Boscus sokemannorum de Prestegraue similiter.

[1] MS. 'debuit.'

hunters gave it to him. And the foresters suspected that he carried away a hart which the king killed in the forest, and it was lost.

And an inquisition was made before the justices, which says that he is not suspected of that hart; and therefore he remains in the custody of the township of Skeffington for inquiries. And William the son of Gunnilda remains in the custody of John the son of Simon his lord for inquiries, because he was seen, as it was said, near the place where the aforesaid hart was killed. And the inquisitions ought to be returned within one year after Easter in the tenth year of John.

Robert of Langton and Robert Samson, verderers of Leicester, are in mercy because they contradicted their writing.

Michael de Neville and Robert of Wyville, verderers, are in mercy because they did not that which they ought; and Hugh the forester and Samuel his colleague are in mercy for the same reason.

Roger the son of Peter of Uppingham is in mercy for a contemptuous act.

Thomas of Huttoft, William of Ash and Henry of Uppingham, Alexander of Martinsthorpe, verderers, are in mercy because they did that which they ought not to do.

The township of Oakham is in mercy because they had not Robert the servant of the Earl of Hereford, whom they pledged.

The township of Egleton is in mercy because they did not come before the justices as they ought.

The township of Knossington is in mercy because they had not those whom they pledged, to wit Richard and William who were found with bows and arrows in the road towards Rockingham.

Benedict of Haversham offers half a mark to the king for having his wood which was taken into the king's hand; and an inquiry is to be made, by whom.

Roger le Moin offers to the king half a mark for the same.

The sheriff of Rutland is in mercy because he had not the prisoners who were delivered to him by the hands of the foresters to guard.

Be it remembered that the wood of Reynold of Withcote is to be taken into the king's hands.

The wood of the sokemen of Prestgrave likewise.

III.[1]

PLACITA FORESTE APUD SALOPESBURY DIE[2] SABBATI PROXIMA POST MEDIAM QUADRAGESIMAM ANNO REGNI REGIS IOHANNIS DECIMO CORAM H. DE NEUILL' ET P. DE LEONIBUS.

Quidam ceruus intrauit in balliua castelli de Bruges per posternam; et castellani de Bruges eum ceperunt et tulerunt ad castellum. Et viridarii hoc audientes illuc venerunt et interrogauerunt a Thoma[3] de Ardinton' tunc vicecomite quid fecisset de ceruo illo. Et ille recognouit quod ita fuit, et manucepit homines suos veniendi coram iusticiariis etc; scilicet Matheum constabularium Rogerum de Fugeriis et Ricardum de Bromwic et Robertum Portarium et Walranum fratrem Mathei; et non habuit eos coram iusticiariis. Iudicium etc.

Villata de Bruges attachiata fuit pro eodem ceruo.

Ricardus de Prestwode itinerans per balliuam suam de Morf sequebatur duos homines quousque inuenit eos scilicet Hugonem de Bectebury et Thomam fratrem eius; et habebant tres leporarios extra lessam et quinque lepores. Et cum ipse Ricardus cepisset predictum Hugonem, predictus Thomas frater eius extracto gladio eum liberauit, et fugauerunt ambo et idem Ricardus statim leuauit clamorem, et sequebatur eos donec nox ab eo illos abstulit etc.

Robertus venator Roberti Corbet et Robertus filius eiusdem Roberti Corbet ceperunt vnum ceruum sub villa de Stratton' ubi venit Codigan seruiens vicecomitis cui dederunt vnam quissam et vnam costam ad portandum cum eo apud Rintheton. Et aliam quissam dederunt Codwellan'. Tunc supervenit Radulfus forestarius Walteri de Muneton', et cepit predictum Robertum venatorem et duos canes. Robertus filius Roberti fugiit cum capite cerui et furcio et cornu cerui et vnam de costis; et illos tradidit Hugoni filio Roberti qui dimisit predictum Robertum et canes et venacionem custodiendos per breue Hugonis de Neuill' usque ad placita foreste. Custodes[4] Roberti Corbet, Rogerus Purcell', Robertus de Hanewode, Hugo Mersse, Robertus de

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 144. This also is from an official transcript made towards the close of the thirteenth century.

[2] 14 March 120$\frac{8}{9}$.

[3] Thomas of Ardington was sheriff of the counties of Stafford and Salop from Michaelmas 1204 to 13 April 1216. See *List of Sheriffs*, p. 117.

[4] The word 'uenatoris' is probably omitted here.

III.

PLEAS OF THE FOREST AT SHREWSBURY ON THE SATURDAY[2] NEXT AFTER THE MIDDLE OF LENT IN THE TENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING JOHN BEFORE HUGH DE NEVILLE AND PETER DE LION.

A certain hart entered the bailiwick of the castle of Bridge by the postern; and the castellans of Bridge took it and carried it to the castle. And the verderers on hearing this came there and demanded of Thomas of Ardington, who was then the sheriff what he had done with that hart, and he acknowledged the truth, and undertook that his men should come before the justices, that is to say Matthew the Constable, Roger de Feugères and Richard of Bromwich and Robert the Porter, and Walerand the brother of Matthew; and he had them not before the justices etc. Judgment etc.

The township of Bridge was attached for the same hart.

Richard of Prestwood, journeying through their bailiwick of Morf followed two men until he found them, that is to say Hugh of Beckbury and Thomas his brother; and they had three greyhounds unleashed and five hares. And when the same Richard took the aforesaid Hugh, the aforesaid Thomas his brother, with drawn sword, delivered him; and they both fled. And the same Richard immediately raised the hue and followed them until night stole them away from him etc.

Robert the hunter of Robert Corbet and Robert the son of the same Robert Corbet took a hart under the town of Stretton, where came Codigan the servant of the sheriff, to whom they gave a thigh and a rib to carry with him to Rhiston, and they gave the other thigh to Codwellan. Then came up Ralph, the forester of Walter of Minton, and took the aforesaid Robert the hunter and two dogs. Robert the son of Robert fled with the hart's head, and the breast, and an antler, and one of the ribs. And Ralph delivered them to Hugh the son of Robert, who by the writ of Hugh de Neville delivered the aforesaid Robert and the dogs and the venison to be kept safely until the pleas of the forest. The custodians of [the hunter of] Robert Corbet were Roger Purcell, Robert of Hanwood, Hugh Mersse, Robert of Hope,

Hope, Radulfus de Le, Wido de Arundel, Rogerus Springehose, Wido de Merse, Robertus de Langeford, Robertus filius Maddoc, Reinerus de Acton' et Ricardus de Witon'. Et quia non habuerunt[1] predictum venatorem nec venacionem nec canes qui commissi fuerunt eis in custodia, adiudicat.[2]

Custodes[3] predicti, preter Robertum Corbet, ante iudicium finem fecerunt per sexaginta marcas vt quieti sint[4] de custodia illa. Vicecomes habet plegios.

Robertus Corbet dicit quod dominus rex condonauit ei loquelam illam, et non illum trahit ad warantum. Et quia est baro domini regis et regem trahit ad warantum, dies datus est ei coram rege a die coram rege. Mercurii[5] proxima post diem Pasche in vnum mensem ad habendum ibi Robertum venatorem suum.

De Rogero filio suo dixit qui fugiit cum capite cerui et cum furchia quod fuit cum comite Cestr' et nesciuit vbi fuit, set id mandaret ei quod veniat ad curiam et si ipse illuc veniat in posterum ipsum in manu capiet habendi recto.

Ricardus de Holton', Wilkinus de Estlegh', Hulle de Hineton' et Hulle Robucke seruientes comitatus inuenerunt in domo Hugonis le Scot venacionem, et ipse H. fugiit ad ecclesiam. Et cum viridarii et forestarii illuc uenissent interrogauerunt de ipso H. vnde illa venacio venit, et ipse et quidam alius Rogerus de Welinton' nomine recognouit quod occiderant vnam bissam vnde illa venacio fuit; et ipse noluit exire de ecclesia illa, set ibi moram fecit per vnum mensem et postea euasit in specie mulieris. Et fugitiuus est; et Rogerus de Welinton' similiter. Preceptum est autem quod exigantur et nisi uenerint[6] vtlagentur.

Villate de Welinton', Ardulueston', Laueleg', Keteleg' in misericordia, quia negauerunt quod prius cognouerunt.

Preceptum est quod viuarium[7] de Stirlegh' capiatur in manu regis pro ceruo in eo submerso.

Inquirendum de exitu terrarum forestariorum de Clauerlegh' et de Vrfeld postquam amoti fuerunt a forestaria.

Villata de Kenelegh' in misericordia quia negauerunt quod prius dixerunt.

Milites et homines manentes in Brewode in Salopsir' dant domino regi centum marcas vt ipsi et heredes eorum sint inperpetuum de-

[1] MS. 'habuit.'

[2] The original probably contained the words 'ad iudicium' instead of this word.

[3] The elder Robert Corbet was responsible for his hunter and his son as his mainpasts.

[4] MS. 'sunt.'

[5] 29 April 1209.

[6] MS. 'uenit.'

[7] MS. 'virarium.'

Ralph of Lee, Guy of Arundel, Roger Springehose, Guy of Marsh, Robert of Langford, Robert the son of Maddoc, Reyner of Acton and Richard of Wytton. And because they had not the aforesaid hunter nor the venison nor the dogs which were entrusted to them to keep safely, to judgment with them.

The aforesaid custodians, except Robert Corbet, made fine before judgment by sixty marks in order that they might be quit of that custody. The sheriff has the pledges.

Robert Corbet says that the king pardoned him that plea, and now he vouches him to warranty, and because he is a baron of the king and vouches him to warranty, a day is given him on Wednesday[5] a month after Easter to have there Robert his hunter.

Of Robert his son, who fled with the hart's head and with the breast, he said that he was with the Earl of Chester and that he did not know where he was, but would send orders to him to come to the court, and if he come thither afterwards he will undertake to have him stand to right.

Richard of Holton, Wilkin of Eastlegh, Hulle of Hinton, and Hulle Roebuck, the serjeants of the county, found venison in the house of Hugh le Scot. And Hugh fled to the church; and when the foresters and verderers came thither they demanded of Hugh whence that venison came. And he and a certain other person, Roger of Wellington by name, acknowledged that they had killed a hind from which that venison came. And he refused to leave the church but lingered there for a month; and afterwards escaped in the guise of a woman. And he is a fugitive; and Roger of Wellington likewise. It is ordered that they be exacted, and unless they come let them be outlawed.

The townships of Wellington, Arleston, Lawley and Ketley are in mercy because they denied what they had previously acknowledged.

It is ordered that the vivary of Sturchley be taken in the king's hand for a hart which was drowned in it.

An inquiry is to be made as to the issues of the land of the foresters of Claverley and Worfield after they were removed from office.

The township of Kenley is in mercy because they denied what they had previously said.

The knights and men dwelling in Brewood in Shropshire give to the king a hundred marks so that they and their heirs may be for ever

afforestati secundum quod continetur in carta[1] domini regis quam ipsi et homines de Staffordssir' inde,[1] ita quod omnes illi de comitatu de Salopes' qui venati sunt uel bestias ceperunt in predicta Brewode infra comitatum Salop' communicent cum predictis militibus et hominibus ad predictum finem racionabiliter secundum quod quilibet eorum sit.

Warinus de Wilegh' in misericordia pro pall' dentis inuentis in sepe sua; set non malecreditur.

De Roberto de Bromfeld duo solidi pro essarto.

Iohannes Hopestan et Willelmus de Wistaneswic in misericordia pro falsa querela.

Willelmus de la Rugge dat dimidiam marcam ne boueria sua, quam leuauit super terram suam apud Sutton', remoueatur.

De Philippo de Fernlawe dimidiam marcam quia non habuit quem plegiauit in Staffordsir.'

misericordia. Hamo filius Marescalli[2] cepit lepores in warenna de Bulregg'.

misericordia. Hugo Extraneus similiter.

misericordia. Homines Willelmi filii Alani similiter.

Walterus de Bascherthe in misericordia quia cognouit quod prius negauit.

Staffordesir'. Viuianus de Rushal' dat tres marcas vt quietus sit de plegiacio.

Preceptum est Guidoni venatori quod cum viridariis capiat terram Thome de Costentin et boscum suum qui per falsam iuratam eiectus[3] fuit de foresta, et similiter quod inquirat nomina illorum qui iuratam illam fecerunt, et habere faciat.

Iohannes Baggot recepit apud Blemenhull' canes et bersatores in Staff' qui veniebant ad currendum in Turrewode.

Hamo de Weston' similiter recepit canes et bersatores apud Westan'.

Nomina[4] viridariorum in Salopsir'.[5]

[1] The Charter above mentioned is thus enrolled on the roll of Charters of the fifth year of John:—

'*Carta de Browuda*. Iohannes dei gracia etc. Sciatis nos omnino deaforestasse forestam de Browuda de omnibus que ad forestam et forestarios pertinent. Quare uolumus et firmiter precipimus quod predicta foresta et homines in ea manentes et heredes eorum sint deaforestati inperpetuum et soluti et quieti de nobis et heredibus nostris ab omnibus que ad forestam vel forestarios pertinent. Testibus G. filio Petri etc., W. Marescallo comite de Penbroc R. comite Cestr', W. comite Sarr', W. comite de Warenn', Willelmo de Breosa etc. Data per manum S. prepositi Beuerl' etc. apud Bruges xiij die Marcii anno etc. quinto.'

[2] MS. 'Marescat.'

[3] MS. 'eiecit.'

[4] The names are not written in the roll.

[5] The above official transcripts were made in the reign of Edward i. when his forests were being perambulated with a view to those parts of them which had been improperly afforested being disafforested. His advisers had transcripts made of some of the forest eyre rolls of the reigns of John and Henry iii. in order to ascertain what places had formerly been considered to be within the forests. The following entry is written on the last official transcript printed above:—

'Et sciendum quod plures alii amerciantur pro eodem prout continetur in rotulo qui incipit sic:—Amerciamenta de viridi, usque Summam vij li' ix s^{i}. Et quia nulla mentio fit de aliqua villata non scribitur plus de rotulo illo.'

disforested according to the contents of the king's charter which they and the men of Staffordshire have thereof; upon condition that all those of the county of Shropshire who have hunted or taken beasts in the aforesaid Brewood within the county of Shropshire may share with the aforesaid knights and men in the aforesaid fine each according to his means.

Warin of Willey is in mercy for —— found in his hedge; but he is not suspected.

Of Robert of Bromfield two shillings for an essart.

John Hopestan and William of Wistanswick are in mercy for a false complaint.

William of the Ridge gives half a mark in order that his cowhouse which he erected upon his land at Sutton be not removed.

Of Philip of Fernlaw half a mark because he has not him whom he pledged in Staffordshire.

Hamo the son of the Marshall took hares in the warren of Bulridge.

Hugh l'Estrange likewise.

The men of William fitz Alan likewise.

Walter of Baschurch is in mercy because he acknowledged what he had previously denied.

Vivian of Rushall gives three marks in order that he may be quit of his suretyship.

Guy the hunter is ordered, with the verderers, to take the land of Thomas de Costentin and his wood which by a false jury was put out of the forest, and in like manner to inquire the names of those who formed that jury, and let him cause . . . .

John Baggot harboured at Blymhill dogs and poachers in Staffordshire who came to hunt in Turrewode.

Hamo of Weston in like manner received dogs and poachers at Weston.

Names of the verderers in Salop. . . .

IV.[1]

PLACITA FORESTE IN COMITATU HUNTINDON' A DIE SANCTE TRINITATIS IN QUINDECIM DIES[2] ANNO REGNI REGIS HENRICI FILII REGIS IOHANNIS TRICESIMO NONO CORAM WILLELMO LE BRITON' NICOLAO DE ROMES' GALFRIDO DE LEUECNOR' ET SYMONE DE TROPP' IUSTICIARIIS ITINERANTIBUS AD PLACITA FORESTE IN COMITATU HUNTIND' ET ALIIS COMITATIBUS.[3]

ij marce — Symon de Copmanford' (alibi), Robertus Wyne (j marca[4]), Iohannes Ballard (dimidia marca) Ricardus le Port' (dimidia marca) viridarii in misericordia, quia non presentauerunt rotulos suos primo die.

Ricardus de Grafha' qui fuit canonicus Huntond' stulte recessit a domo sua et venit per patriam quasi vagus, suspectus habebatur. Forestarii inuenerunt illum in domo Willelmi de Grafha'; et illuc inuentus fuit vnus arcus cum quinque paruis sagittis. Et dictum Ricardum ceperunt et arcum et sagittas; et ipsum Ricardum inprisonauerunt. Qui venit coram iusticiariis. Et protestatum fuit per forestarios et viridarios et per quatuor villatas quod non fuit quietus. — malefactor in foresta, nec in aliquo culpabilis; et ideo quietus. Et dictus Willelmus, in cuius domo ipse fuit inuentus, deaduocauit arcum misericordia ij s. — et sagittas, nec sciuit dicere, cuius fuerunt; et ideo in misericordia.

[5]Presentatum est[6] per forestarios [et] viridarios quod quidam Michaelis de Dupenha' manupastus Iohannis de Dupenha' occidit vnum damum in campo de Iakel' cum quadam hacha a pik. Qui Michaelis captus fuit per Hugonem[7] de Goldinha' senescallum foreste,

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 41, Roll 6.

[2] 6 June 1255.

[3] The letters patent appointing these persons itinerant justices are enrolled on Patent Roll 65, m. 7, and the letters close ordering the Sheriff of Huntingdon to summon all who ought to attend at the court of the forest eyre on Close Roll 70, m. 12 in dorso.

[4] The amercements which are interlineated in the original and printed in the Latin text above in brackets are omitted in the English translation so as to save space.

[5] See p. 76.

[6] In mediaeval Latin the present indicative passive of many verbs was not in general use, the perfect passive being used instead of it, and the past participle with the perfect indicative of the auxiliary verb 'esse' instead of the perfect passive. Thus 'presentatum est' means 'it is presented,' and 'presentatum fuit,' 'it was presented.'

[7] The forest of Huntingdon was part of a large forest bailiwick, which extended from Stamford bridge to Oxford bridge. Hugh of Goldingham was appointed steward or warden of this bailiwick, but not until 6 March 125$\frac{4}{5}$. (See Patent Roll 65, memb. 12.) It is clear from the inquisition printed on p. 76 that this trespass was committed on 6 October 1250. Hugh must therefore have been only deputy steward at this time to Geoffrey of Langley, who then held the office.

IV.

PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF HUNTINGDON IN THE QUINDENE [2] OF HOLY TRINITY IN THE THIRTY-NINTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY THE SON OF KING JOHN BEFORE WILLIAM LE BRETON NICHOLAS OF ROMSEY GEOFFREY OF LEWKNOR AND SIMON OF THORP JUSTICES IN EYRE FOR PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF HUNTINGDON AND OTHER COUNTIES.

Simon of Coppingford, Robert Wynne, John Ballard, Richard le Porter, verderers, are in mercy because they did not present their rolls the first day.

Richard of Grafham, who was a canon of Huntingdon, contemptously withdrew from his house, and came through the country as a wanderer; he was suspected. The foresters found him in the house of William of Grafham; and a bow with five little arrows was found there. And they took the said Richard and the bow and the arrows and imprisoned the same Richard. And he came before the justices. And it was testified by the foresters and verderers and by four townships that he was not an evil doer in the forest nor in any respect guilty; therefore he is quit. And the said William in whose house he was found disavowed the bow and the arrows; nor could he say whose they were; and therefore he is in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that a certain Michael of Debenham, the mainpast of John of Debenham, killed a buck in the field of Yaxley with a certain pick axe. And this Michael was taken by Hugh of Goldingham the steward of the forest

et liberatus Henrico de Coleuil',[1] tunc vicecomiti Huntind', qui ipsum posuit in prisonam de Huntind'. Et ipse euasit a dicta prisona; ideo ad iudicium de euasione super dictum Henricum qui mortuus est. Et quia Iohannes de Depenha' (xx s) dictum Michaelem receptauit post istud factum, et modo non habuit ipsum coram iusticiariis, ideo in misericordia. Et Michaelis modo non venit, ideo exigatur etc. Et Ricardus de Stilton' vidit ubi predictus Michaelis occidit predictum damum, et non leuauit hutesium. Modo non venit et fuit attachiatus per Oliuerum de Vpton'. Et quia dictus Ricardus essoniatus fuit primo de morte, et testatum fuit quod mortuus est; ideo plegii sui inde quieti. Et quia villate de Iakel' (vj marce), Folkesworth' (j marca), Stilton' (j marca), Morburn' (xx s) non venerunt coram iusticiario [ad] inquisicionem faciendam; ideo in misericordia.

iudicium.

misericordia xx s exigatur.

ix marce dimidia. misericordie.

Presentatum est per forestarios quod Walterus Scharp', venator magistri Rogeri de Rauelingha', inuentus fuit in foresta cum arcu et sagittis. Et testatum est per viridarios quod dictus Walterus non venit illuc occasione malefaciendi in foresta. Et idem Walterus venit modo et non potuit dedicere quin portaret arcum et sagittas contra assisam foreste; ideo in misericordia per pleuinam dicti magistri Rogeri de Rauelinha'. Postea perdonatur.

misericordia.

[2] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod conuictum est per inquisicionem villarum Alkesinbir', Weston', Magna Stiuecl' et Parua quod quidam Geruasius homo Iohannis de Crachale visus fuit noctanter in foresta occasione malefaciendi cum malefactoribus ignotis cum leporariis arcubus et sagittis. Et postea fuit inuentus idem Geruasius ducens hernasium domini sui Iohannis[3] de Crachal' infra curiam grangiarum prioratus Huntind', et ibidem captus per forestarios et in prisona Huntind' positus. Et super hoc venerunt Walterus vicarius ecclesie sancte Marie Hunt' et alii capellani eiusdem ville, quorum nomina ignorantur et Willelmus de Leycestr'[4] (xx s) seruiens episcopi Linc,' et dictum Geruasium de prisona ceperunt tanquam clericum, et secum duxerunt. Et idem Geruasius modo non venit et ideo preceptum est magistro Rogero de Raueling' archidiacono Hunt' qui presens est quod habeat dictum Walterum vicarium et alios coram iusticiariis die Dominica etc. Ad diem venit dictus magister Rogerus et duxit Walterum vicarium (c s) qui dicit quod cum dictus Geruasius (dimidia marca) captus esset et inprisonatus ut predictum est, venit

xx s.

c s.

dimidia marca.

[1] Hugh de Colleville was sheriff of the counties of Huntingdon and Cambridge from 11 May 1249 till 6 October 1251. See *List of Sheriffs*.

[2] See p. 77.

[3] In the year 1260 John of Crakehall was acting as king's treasurer. See Close Roll 79, memb. 19 dorso. See p. 77.

[4] The words 'prope Graham in comitatu Lincoln' in Yngoldely' are here interlineated in the roll.

and delivered to Henry de Colleville, then the sheriff of Huntingdon, who put him in the prison of Huntingdon. And he escaped from the said prison; therefore to judgment for the escape with the said Henry, who is dead. And because John of Debenham harboured the said Michael after that deed, and now has him not before the justices, therefore he is in mercy. And Michael does not come now, therefore let him be exacted etc. And Richard of Stilton saw where the aforesaid Michael killed the aforesaid buck, and did not raise the hue. Now he does not come; and he was attached by Oliver of Upton. And because the said Richard was essoined of death on the first day, and it was witnessed that he is dead, therefore his pledges are quit thereof. And because the townships of Yaxley, Folksworth, Stilton and Morborne did not come before the justice to make inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters that Walter Sharp the hunter of master Roger of Raveningham was found in the forest with a bow and arrows. And it is witnessed by the verderers that the said Walter did not come there for the purpose of evil doing in the forest. And the same Walter now came, and could not deny that he carried a bow and arrows against the assise of the forest; therefore he is in mercy by the pledge of the said master Roger of Raveningham. Afterwards he is pardoned.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that it is proved by an inquisition of the towns of Alconbury, Weston, Great Stukeley and Little Stukeley that a certain Gervais a man of John of Crakehall was seen at night in the forest for the purpose of evil doing with unknown evil doers, with greyhounds, bows and arrows. And afterwards the same Gervais was found carrying the harness of his lord, John of Crakehall, within the court of the granges of the priory of Huntingdon, and was there taken by the foresters and put in the prison of Huntingdon. And upon this came Walter, the vicar of the church of St. Mary of Huntingdon, and other chaplains of the same town, whose names are not known, and William of Leicester, a servant of the bishop of Lincoln. And they took the said Gervais from prison as a clerk, and led him away with them. And now the same Gervais does not come; and therefore master Roger of Raveningham, archdeacon of Huntingdon, who is present, is ordered to have the said Walter the vicar and the others before the justices on Sunday etc. At that day came the said master Roger, and brought Walter the vicar, who says that when the said Gervais was taken and imprisoned as aforesaid, he

cum sociis suis capellanis et fecit ammonicionem quod ipsum G. a prisona deliberassent et sancte ecclesie restituissent, eo quod clericus fuit. Et forestarii timentes excomunicacionem ipsum permiserunt abire, et nichil aliud fecerunt. Et dictum est dicto Waltero quod predictum G. contra pacem et vi a prisona extraxit et abduxit. Requisitus qualiter se velit aquietare dicit quod non uult in ista curia respondere. Ideo requisitum est a forestariis et viridariis vtrum dictus Walterus et alii ipsum G. a prisona abduxerunt uel forestarii sentenciam timentes ipsum voluntarie abire permiserunt. Qui dicunt quod Willelmus de Leyc' et Walterus et alii venerunt ad forestarios cum libris et candelis volentes ipsos excomunicare nisi predictum G. a prisona deliberassent, qui dixerunt quod non habuerunt potestatem ipsum deliberare; et tunc accesserunt ad prisonam et ipsum G. extraxerunt et abduxerunt. Et magister Rogerus venit et petit dictum Walterum tanquam capellanum. Et liberatus fuit ei convictus de predicto facto. Et postea venit dictus G. et convictum est per forestarios et viridarios quod est malefactor de venacione. Et predictus magister Rogerus petit ipsum tanquam clericum et liberatur ei tanquam malefactor aperte et de hoc convictus. Et quia Iohannes de Crachal' (x marce) receptauit illum Geruasium post illud factum et adhuc stat cum eodem, ideo in misericordia.

W. et G. liberati magistro Rogero Archidiacono.

misericordia. x marce.

[1] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod Ricardus cocus domini Ricardi comitis Gloc', Willelmus marescallus et Walterus clericus de camera eiusdem comitis in eundo de Huntind' uersus Stanford' ad parandum hospicium domini sui, die Veneris [2] proxima ante festum sancti Andree, quando dictus comes iuit uersus Ebor', ceperunt vnam damam cum leporariis suis. Quod factum forestarii domino comiti statim intimauerunt, qui factum illud bene aduocauit. Et ideo coram rege.

coram rege.

[3] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod die [4] Sabbati proxima ante annunciacionem beate Marie anno etc. tricesimo septimo infra noctem capti fuerunt duo leporarii per forestam currentes ad bestias. Inquisicio facta fuit per villatas de Magna Stiuecl' (xx s), Rypton' Abbatis (xx s), Herford' (j marca) et Rypton' Regis (j marca) de dictis leporariis cuius essent et vnde venissent. Et nichil inquiri potuit. Et quia dicte villate non venerunt plenarie ad inquisicionem; ideo in misericordia. Et Iohannes [5] Mansel' tunc

v marce.

misericordia.

[1] See p. 78. [2] 24 November 1251.
[3] See p. 78.
[4] 22 March 125$\frac{2}{3}$.
[5] John Mansel was appointed bailiff of the forests between Stamford bridge and Oxford bridge in succession to Geoffrey of Langley by letters patent dated 24 October 1252. See Patent Roll 61, memb. 1.

came with his fellow chaplains and admonished them that they should deliver the same Gervais from prison, and restore him to holy Church on the ground that he was a clerk. And the foresters, fearing excommunication, permitted him to depart and did nothing else. And the said Walter was told that he took out of prison and carried away the aforesaid Gervais against the peace and by force. And, being asked how he wished to acquit himself, he says that he will not answer in this court; therefore the foresters and verderers are asked whether the said Walter and the others carried away the same Gervais from prison or whether the foresters, fearing an ecclesiastical sentence, of their own will permitted him to depart. They say, that William of Leicester and Walter and the others came to the foresters with books and candles meaning to excommunicate them if they did not deliver the aforesaid Gervais from prison, and they said that they had not power to deliver him. And then William and the others went to the prison and dragged out and carried away the same Gervais. And master Roger comes and demands the said Walter as his chaplain, and he was delivered to him convicted of the aforesaid deed. And afterwards comes the said Gervais; and it is proved by the foresters and verderers that he is an evil doer to the venison. And the aforesaid master Roger demands him as a clerk; and he is delivered to him as a manifest evil doer, and one convicted of this. And because John of Crakehall harboured this Gervais after that deed, and he still stands by him, therefore he is in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that Richard the cook of Sir Richard, earl of Gloucester, William the marshall, and Walter the clerk of the chamber of the same earl, on their way from Huntingdon to Stamford to make ready the house of their lord, on the Friday[2] next before the feast of St. Andrew, when the said earl was going towards York, took a doe with their greyhounds. And the foresters forthwith made known this deed to the earl, who vouched it well. And therefore before the king.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that the Saturday[4] next before the Annunciation of the blessed Mary in the thirty-seventh year during the night, two greyhounds which were running through the forest after beasts were taken. Inquisition was made by the townships of Great Stukeley, Abbots Ripton, Hartford and King's Ripton concerning the said greyhounds, whose they were, and whence they came; and nothing could be ascertained. And because the said townships did not come fully to make inquisition, therefore they

summus senescallus foreste habuit dictos leporarios de quibus est responsurus.

responsurus est.

[1] Presentatum est per forestarios [et] viridarios quod vnus capellanus et septem clerici inuenti fuerunt cum arcubus et sagittis in regali via infra forestam. Capti fuerunt per forestarios per suspicionem, quos Hugo de Goldinha' senescallus [2] foreste in prisona retinuit. Et postea illos liberauit Symoni [3] de Hogton' tunc vicecomiti Huntind' qui ipsos inprisonauit in prisona Cantebr'. Et postea coram magistro Symone [4] de Wauton' et sociis suis iusticiariis itinerantibus apud Huntind' deliberati fuerunt Roberto [5] tunc Linc' episcopo tanquam clerici. Et quia dictus Symon tunc vicecomes non intimauit dictis iusticiariis quod capti essent in foresta per forestarios pro malefacto et transgressione, ideo in misericordia. Et quia Symon de Copmanford', viridarius, cui arcus et sagitte traditi fuerunt, quod illos haberet coram iusticiariis, et modo non habuit, ideo in misericordia.

misericordia.

misericordia.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod die [6] sancti Iohannis Baptiste post prandium inuentus fuit quidam leporarius currens post vnam herdiam bestiarum, quem leporarium Henricus de Hecmundecote tunc forestarius pedes cepit. Et statim quidam garcio sequutus fuit dictum leporarium, quem garcionem similiter cepit cum vno cornu et septem sagittis. Et ipsum et leporarium duxit ad hospicium Willelmi de Rading', domini sui forestarii equitis; qui garcionem et leporarium pro eo quod fuerunt de domo et familia magistri Symonis de Wauton', tunc existentis iusticiarii itinerantis apud Hund', duxit ad hospicium dicti magistri Symonis, et ipsos ei liberauit. Ideo mandatum [7] est vicecomiti Buk' quod venire faciat Galfridum [8] de Childewyc', tunc senescallum foreste, sub quo dictus Willelmus de Rading' fuit, coram iusticiariis [9] etc. die Veneris [10] proxima post festum sancti Barnabe apostoli. Ad diem non venit, ideo mandatum est iterum.

mandatum est.

Galfridus filius Alani de Sybetorp' suspectus de malefacto in foresta cum arcu et sagittis venit; et requisitus qualiter se velit

[1] See p. 79.

[2] See p. 11, note 7.

[3] Simon of Houghton was sheriff of Huntingdon and Cambridge from 6 October 1251 to 17 October 1253. See *List of Sheriffs*.

[4] Simon of Walton was itinerating with other justices at Huntingdon from 25 May to 23 June 1253. See Feet of Fines, Case 92, File 10.

[5] This was the illustrious Robert Grossetête, bishop of Lincoln.

[6] 24 June 1253.

[7] In these rolls 'mandatum' means an order sent to a person not present; 'preceptum,' an order given to a person who is present. The distinction is accurately observed.

[8] There is no enrolment in the Patent Rolls of the appointment of Geoffrey of Childwick as steward of the bailiwick between Oxford and Stamford bridges. It is probable that, like Hugh of Goldingham, he was only a deputy steward.

[9] MS. 'istic.'

[10] 18 June 1255.

are in mercy. And John Mansel, then chief steward of the forest, had the said greyhounds; and he is to answer for them.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that a chaplain and seven clerks were found with bows and arrows in the king's road within the forest. They were taken by the foresters on suspicion. And Hugh of Goldingham, steward of the forest, retained them in prison; and afterwards he delivered them to Simon of Houghton, then sheriff of Huntingdon, who imprisoned them in the prison of Cambridge. And afterwards they were delivered before master Simon of Walton and his fellows justices in eyre at Huntingdon to Robert then the bishop of Lincoln as clerks. And because the said Simon, then the sheriff, did not send word to the said justices that they were taken in the forest by the foresters for an evil deed and for trespass, therefore he is in mercy. And because Simon of Coppingford, the verderer, to whom the bows and arrows were delivered, that he might have them before the justices, now had them not, therefore he is in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that on the day[6] of St. John the Baptist after dinner a certain greyhound was found running after a herd of beasts. And Henry of Heathencote, then a walking forester, took the greyhound; and immediately afterwards a certain boy followed the said greyhound. And he took in like manner the boy, with a horn and seven arrows. And he brought him and the greyhound to the house of his lord William of Reading, the riding forester, who brought the boy and the greyhound, on the ground that they were of the house and establishment of master Simon of Walton, then a justice in eyre at Huntingdon, to the house of the said master Simon, and delivered them to him. Therefore an order is sent to the sheriff of Buckingham that he cause Geoffrey of Childwick, then the steward of the forest, under whom the said William of Reading was, to be before the justices etc. on the Friday[10] next after the feast of St. Barnabas the Apostle. On this day he does not come; therefore an order is sent a second time.

Geoffrey the son of Alan of Sibthorpe, who was suspected of an evil deed in the forest with a bow and arrow, comes, and, being asked

aquietare de illa suspicione, dicit quod per forestarios viridarios et quatuor villatas propinquiores. Qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod non est culpabilis de aliquo malefacto in foresta. Et quia idem Galfridus non venit primo die, et fuit attachiatus per Symonem Man de Sybetorp', Willelmum Man fratrem eius de eadem, Iohannem forestarium de eadem, Willelmum de Well' de eadem, Ricardum Gamelyn de eadem et Walterum Buc de Elincton', ideo omnes in misericordia.

misericordie.[1]

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod die[2] Martis proxima post clausam Pasche anno tricesimo nono circa mediam noctem tres malefactores ignoti venerunt apud Sappell' cum arcubus et sagittis et duobus leporariis quos permiserunt curere ad bestias. Et forestarii ceperunt dictos leporarios et miserunt domino regi. Inquisicio facta qui essent ipsi malefactores per villatas de Rypton' Regis (alibi) et Rypton' Abbatis (alibi), Herford' (alibi), Parua Stiuecle (j marca), qui nichil inde potuerunt inquirere. Et quia non venerunt plenarie ad inquirendum, ideo in misericordia. Et quia Magna Stiuecle (alibi) non venit coram iusticiario ad inquisicionem inde faciendam, ideo in misericordia.

j marca. misericordia. misericordia.

Presentatum est per forestarios quod Willelmus de Boleuil' habet leporarios infra metas foreste sine licencia. Qui venit et dicit quod nullos habet nec habuit et de hoc ponit se super viridarios et quatuor villatas, scilicet, Pacston', Toleslund', Offord' et Gomecestr', qui dicunt quod dictus Willelmus nullos habet nec habuit leporarios; et ideo inde quietus.

quietus.

Presentatum fuit per regardatores coram Ernaldo[3] de Bosco, tunc iusticiario foreste, quod Willelmus Cardon' habuit leporarios infra metas foreste sine licencia. Qui venit et defendit et dicit quod nullos habet nec habuit; et de hoc ponit se super forestarios viridarios et quatuor villatas propinquiores, qui dicunt quod dictus Willelmus est residens in comitatu Norhamt' infra libertatem,[4] et ibi habet leporarios cum quibus Willelmus Brond' et Gilbertus de Yslep' homines dicti Willelmi et Willelmus Cardon' filius eius cuccurerunt in isto comitatu infra forestam et lepores ceperunt. Et dictus Willelmus Cardon' venit; et Willelmus filius eius, Gilbertus de Yslep' et Willelmus Brond

[1] This word is erased and followed by 'quia homines abbatis de Rames'.'

[2] 6 April 1255.

[3] Arnold de Bois was appointed justice of the forest south of the Trent by letters patent dated 16 February 125⅗. See Patent Roll 62, memb. 16.

[4] The word 'libertas,' besides being used of a district in which a subject had the right of exercising certain royal privileges, seems to have occasionally denoted any land not subject to the forest law. At this time there was more of 'foresta' than 'libertas' in the county of Northampton. See also p. 44.

how he wishes to acquit himself of that suspicion, says by the foresters, verderers, and four neighbouring townships, who say upon their oath that he is not guilty of any evil deed in the forest. And because the said Geoffrey did not come the first day, and was attached by Simon Man of Sibthorpe, William Man his brother of the same town, John the forester of the same town, William of Wells of the same town, Richard Gamelyn of the same town and Walter Buck of Ellington, therefore they are all in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that on the Tuesday [2] next after the close of Easter in the thirty-ninth year about midnight, three unknown evil doers came to Sapley with bows and arrows and two greyhounds which they permitted to run after beasts. And the foresters took the said greyhounds and sent them to the lord king. An inquisition was made as to who were the malefactors by the townships King's Ripton, Abbots Ripton, Hartford, Little Stukeley, who could ascertain nothing thereof. And because they did not come fully to make inquiries, therefore they are in mercy. And because Great Stukeley did not come before the justice to make inquisition thereof, therefore it is in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters that William de Bolleville has greyhounds within the metes of the forest without licence. He comes and says that he has none, and had none; and of this he puts himself upon the verderers and four townships, to wit Paxton, Toseland, Offord and Godmanchester, who say that the said William neither has nor had any greyhounds; and therefore he is quit thereof.

It was presented by the regarders before Arnold de Bois, then justice of the forest, that William Cardun had greyhounds within the forest without licence. And he comes and denies it; and says that he has none and had none, and of this he puts himself upon the foresters, verderers, and four neighbouring townships, who say that the said William resides in the county of Northampton within the liberty, and has there greyhounds, with which William Brond and Gilbert of Islip, men of the said William, and William Cardun, his son, coursed in this county within the forest, and took hares. And the said William Cardun comes; and William his son, Gilbert of Islip

non veniunt. Et ipse inuenit plegios habendi eos coram iusticiariis die Lune sequenti, scilicet Willelmum filium Ranulfi et Radulfum de Metny. Ad diem venerunt predicti Willelmus Cardon' et alii, et non potuerunt dedicere quin currerent cum dictis leporariis infra metas foreste ad lepores sine waranto. Et dictus Willelmus senior illos habuit; et hoc permisit sine waranto; ideo omnes in misericordia. Plegii misericordie, dictus Willelmus senior, Willelmus filius Ranulfi de Catteworth'. Postea taxatur pro se et hominibus suis ad viginti solidos.

misericordie xx s.

[1] Adhuc de venacione.

Presentatum est per forestarios quod Ricardus de Weston' seruiens abbatis de Wautha' et Willelmus Turkil de Witleshege et Bartholomeus frater eius de eadem de homagio prioris de Ely, et alii quinque homines ignoti de grangia dicti abbatis de Wautha' in Westfen' ceperunt quadraginta cheuerellos in marisco de Kingesdelf' infra metas foreste die [2] Iouis et die Veneris ante festum beati Thome apostoli anno tricesimo nono per preceptum fratris Geruasii de Alfricheseye de abbacia de Wauth', qui eos receptauit. Et non venerunt. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eos venire de die in diem. Ad diem venit frater Geruasius et quidam Bartholomeus Turkil de Witleshege et defendit capcionem dictorum cheuerellorum et omne malefactum in foresta domini regis. Et inquiritur per forestarios et viridarios rei ueritas qui dicunt quod Geruasius non est culpabilis de dicto malefacto nec alio [3] in foresta, set re uera dicunt quod predicti [4] Ricardus et quidam Bartholomeus culpabiles sunt de capcione dictorum quadraginta etc.; set vtrum sit iste Bartholomeus, qui presens est, an alius Bartholomeus esset ad illud factum nesciunt; ideo committitur senescallo prioris de Ely quod sit etc. Et Ricardus non venit etc. Et preceptum fuit vicecomiti Bedef' etc.; ideo preceptum est iterum eidem vicecomiti quod habeat etc. apud Norhamt' in octabis sancti Iohannis [5] etc. Iterum venit dictus Bartholomeus coram iusticiariis, et propter breuitatem temporis non potuit rei ueritas inquiri de facto suo inquirendo; traditur per baillium etc. quod sit apud Norhamt' in octabis sancti Iohannis.[5]

preceptum est.

baillium.

Presentatum est per forestarios quod venator abbatis de Rames'

[1] Roll 6 in dorso.
[2] 17 December 1254.
[3] This word is repeated in the MS.
[4] This word is so extended in the MS.
[5] 1 July 1255.

and William Brond do not come. And William Cardun the elder finds pledges of having them before the justices on the Monday following, to wit William the son of Ralph and Ralph of Metny. On that day came the aforesaid William Cardun and the others, and they could not deny that they coursed with the said greyhounds for hares within the metes of the forest without warrant. And the said William the elder had them and permitted this without warrant; therefore they are all in mercy. Pledges of the amercement the said William the elder, William the son of Ralph of Catworth. Afterwards the amercement is taxed for him and his men at twenty shillings.

As yet of the venison.

It is presented by the foresters that Richard of Weston, a servant of the abbot of Waltham, and William Turkil of Whittlesey and Bartholomew his brother of the same town, of the homage of the prior of Ely and five other unknown men of the grange of the said abbot of Waltham in Westfen, took forty roes in the marsh of Kings Delph, within the metes of the forest on the Thursday [1] and Friday before the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle in the thirty-ninth year, by order of brother Gervais of Arlesey, of the abbey of Waltham, who harboured them. And they did not come. And the sheriff is ordered to cause them to come from day to day. At the appointed day comes brother Gervais and a certain Bartholomew Turkil of Whittlesey, and denies the taking of the said roes and every evil deed in the forest of the lord king. And the truth of the matter is inquired by the foresters and verderers, who say that Gervais is not guilty with respect to the said evil deed, nor to any other in the forest. But in truth they say that the aforesaid Richard and a certain Bartholomew are guilty of the taking of the said forty etc.; but whether it is this Bartholomew who is present or another Bartholomew who was at that deed, they do not know; therefore he is committed to the steward of the prior of Ely that he be etc. And Richard does not come etc. And the sheriff of Bedford was ordered etc. therefore the same sheriff is ordered a second time to have etc. at Northampton on the octave [5] of St. John the Baptist. The aforesaid Bartholomew came before the justices a second time, and on account of shortness of time, the truth could not be ascertained concerning the deed under inquiry. He is delivered in bail etc. that he be at Northampton on the octave [5] of St. John.

It is presented by the foresters that the hunter of the abbot of

et sex canes ipsius abbatis curentes in foresta capti fuerunt per Robertum de Twywell' forestarium in Humberdale infra metas foreste. Et ipsos liberauit Hugoni de Goldinham[1] senescallo foreste qui dictos venatorem et canes nunc habet coram iusticiariis. Et super hoc venit electus[2] Elyens' per atornatum et dicit quod dicti venator et canes capti fuerunt in libera chacia dicti electi domini sui de Humberdal'. Et petit quod inquiratur per viridarios et forestarios; qui dicunt quod dicti venator et canes capti fuerunt in foresta et extra banleucam; set dicunt quod dictus venator non venit ibidem occasione malefaciendi in foresta; immo venit de libertate domini sui infra banleucam suam, et quidam canum suorum currebant uersus mariscum et quidam uersus forestam; et post canes illos iuit ad eos reclamandos et non alia de causa; et hoc fecit inuito abbate et nesciente. Ideo abbas inde quietus et dictus venator, scilicet, Ricardus Trussehare in misericordia quia stulte intrauit forestam cum arcu et sagittis. Et testatum est per forestarium quod septem canes capti fuerunt tunc ibidem; et inuenit plegios habendi illos coram iusticiariis, et modo non habet; ideo plegii in misericordia, scilicet, Willelmus le Noreis et Willelmus de Framlingeham.

misericordia.[3]

misericordia.

[4] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod cum forestarii fecissent vigiliam sub Sapple occasione bailliue sue custodiende obuiauerunt octo hominibus malefactoribus cum leporariis; qui, cum forestarios percepissent ipsos, statim fugerunt. Set vnum de eis ceperunt nomine Radulfum de Fenton', qui missus fuit in prisonam apud Hunt'; et tunc fuit vicecomes Philippus[5] de Stanton'. Postea convictum est per viridarios quod mutauit nomen suum et fecit se sic appellari cum proprium nomen suum esset Hugo le Fekere et quod per infortunium postea submersus fuit. Et quia receptatus fuit in villa de Wardeboys (xx s) extra decennam, ideo in misericordia. Et testatum est per eosdem quod fuit inprisonatus apud Hunt' et ab ipsa euasit; ideo ad iudicium de euasione super Philippum de Stanton' tunc vicecomitem. Idem Hugo le Fekere, quando fuit captus indictauit quosdam Osebertum le Marscall' et Geruasium cocum de consorcio et malefacto de venacione domini regis. Et convictum est

xx s misericordia.

euasio.

[1] See p. 11, note 7.

[2] The bishop elect here mentioned was William of Kilkenny, to whose election the king gave his assent on 25 December 1254. See Patent Roll 65, memb. 15.

[3] This word is cancelled and followed by the words 'quia in fin' abbatis de Rames'. The cancellation is perhaps explained by the following entry on the second roll of this file:—'De abbate de Rames' pro boscis suis vastatis de veteri et pro defalta forestariorum triginta marce.'

[4] See p. 75.

[5] Philip of Stanton was appointed sheriff of Cambridge and Huntingdon on 15 February $124\frac{5}{6}$, and continued in office until 19 April 1249, when John de Chalers succeeded him. See *List of Sheriffs*.

Ramsey and six dogs of the same abbot, which were running in the forest, were taken by Robert of Twywell the forester in Humberdale, within the metes of the forest. And he delivered them to Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, who now has the said hunter and dogs before the justices. And upon this comes the bishop-elect of Ely by his attorney, and says that the said hunter and dogs were taken in the free chace of Humberdale of him the said bishop-elect. And he seeks that inquiry may be made by the verderers and foresters, who say that the said hunter and dogs were taken in the forest and outside the banlieu; but they say that the said hunter did not come there for the purpose of evil doing in the forest; but he came from the liberty of his lord within his banlieu; and some of his dogs were running towards the marsh and some towards the forest; and he went after those dogs to call them back, and for no other reason; and this he did against the will and without the knowledge of the abbot. Therefore the abbot is quit thereof, and the said hunter, to wit Richard Trussehare, is in mercy, because he contemptuously entered the forest with a bow and arrows. And it is witnessed by the forester that the seven dogs were taken then and there; and he found pledges of having them before the justices, and now he has them not; therefore his pledges are in mercy, to wit William le Noreis and William of Framlingham.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that when the foresters had set watch over Sapley for the purpose of guarding their bailiwick they met eight malefactors with greyhounds, who when they saw the foresters forthwith fled. But the foresters took one of them, by name Ralph of Fenton, who was sent to prison at Huntingdon; and Philip of Stanton was then sheriff. Afterwards it is proved by the verderers that he changed his name and caused himself to be so called, when his real name was Hugh le Fekere, and that he was afterwards drowned by accident. And because he was harboured in the town of Warboys outside a tithing, therefore it is in mercy. And it is witnessed by the same persons that he was imprisoned at Huntingdon and escaped therefrom; therefore to judgment for the escape upon Philip of Stanton who was then the sheriff. The same Hugh le Fekere when he was taken, indicted certain persons, Osbert the marshall and Gervais the cook, of consorting with him and of an evil deed to the king's venison. And it is proved by

per viridarios quod dicti Osebertus et Geruasius fuerunt aperti malefactores de venacione. Et Geruasius venit et liberatus fuit archidiacono ut patet supra inter placita.[1] Et Osebertus modo non venit nec aliquis uult eum manucapere uel pro eo respondere, ideo exigatur et vtlagetur.

exigatur et vtlagetur.

Preceptum fuit per Robertum [2] Passel' et socios suos iusticiarios itinerantes vltimo hic ad placita foreste quod domus Vincencii de Stanleg' (dimidia marca) in Litleheye leuate ad nocumentum foreste prosternerentur [3]; quod fuit inpeditum per quosdam Colinum de Merton' et Ricardum de Toleslond' balliuos Philippi de Stanton' tunc vicecomitis Hunt'. Et viridarii testantur quod cum ipsi et forestarii venissent ad dictas [4] domos prosternendas sicut [5] fuit preceptum dicti Colinus et Ricardus de Tolelind' inhibuerunt eis quod non prosternerent illas [6] domos. Et cum forestarii manus dictis domibus inposuissent ad illas discooperiendas et prosternendas dicti Colinus (dimidia marca) et Ricardus (dimidia marca) ipsos vi repulserunt dicentes quod nullo modo prosternere permitterent quia preceptum Philippi de Stanton' tunc vicecomitis Hunt' inde habuerunt. Et viridarii et forestarii ad ipsum vicecomitem accesserunt eidem intimantes quale preceptum habuerunt de dictis domis prosternendis, et quomodo per balliuos suos predictos per preceptum suum fuerunt impediti. Et dictus vicecomes dixit quod nullum preceptum inde habuerunt ab eo, set factum eorum penitus deaduocauit; vnde sic remanet preceptum iusticiariorum et comodum domini regis de predictis domibus prosternendis inperfectum. Et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire de die in diem dictos Colinum et Ricardum. Postea venit Ricardus et non potuit dedicere quin inpediret dictos forestarios et viridarios ut predictum est, et hoc sine waranto; ideo in misericordia.

dimidia marca.

j marca.

preceptum est.

misericordia.

Quidam damus captus fuit in campo de Weninton' die [7] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Gregorii anno tricesimo ut dicebatur. Inquisicio facta fuit per villatas Valton' (j marca), Rauel' Parua (dimidia marca), Ripton' Abbatis (alibi) et Weninton' (dimidia marca), qui dicunt quod nichil sciunt. Et quia villate non venerunt plenarie etc., ideo in misericordia.

misericordie. ij marce.

Quedam dama inuenta fuit mortua morina in campo de Alcumbir'. Inquisicio fuit. Et quia villate de Alcumbir' (xx s), Parua Stiuekele

[1] See p. 13, *supra*.
[2] The letters patent appointing Robert and his fellows itinerant justices are not enrolled; but the amercements of their eyre are enrolled in the Pipe Rolls of 29 Hen. III.
[3] MS. 'prosternarentur.'
[4] MS. 'dictos.'
[5] This word is repeated in the MS.
[6] MS. 'allas.'
[7] 14 March 124$\frac{5}{6}$.

the verderers that the said Osbert and Gervais were overt evil doers to the venison. And Gervais came and was delivered to the archdeacon, as appears above among the pleas. And now Osbert does not come, nor is anyone willing to be his mainperner or to answer for him; therefore let him be exacted and outlawed.

It was ordered by Robert Passelewe and his fellow justices last in eyre here for pleas of the forest that the houses of Vincent of Stanley which had been raised to the nuisance of the forest should be pulled down; and the doing of this was hindered by certain persons, Colin of Merton and Richard of Toseland, the bailiffs of Philip of Stanton the sheriff of Huntingdon. And the verderers witness that when they and the foresters came to pull down the said houses, as they were ordered, the said Colin and Richard of Toseland prohibited them from pulling them down. And when the foresters laid their hands on the said houses to unroof and pull them down, the said Colin and Richard forcibly drove them back saying that they would not in any way allow them to pull them down, because they had the precept to that effect of Philip of Stanton, who was then the sheriff of Huntingdon. And the verderers and foresters went to the same sheriff, and told him the nature of their precept concerning the houses to be pulled down, and how they were hindered by his bailiffs aforesaid by his precept. And the said sheriff said that they had no order thereof from him, and disavowed their deed entirely; whereby the order of the justices and what was for the king's advantage concerning the aforesaid houses to be pulled down remains undone. And therefore the sheriff is ordered that he cause the said Colin and Richard to come from day to day. Afterwards Richard came; and he could not deny that he impeded the said foresters and verderers as is aforesaid, and this without warrant; therefore he is in mercy.

A certain buck was taken in the field of Wennington on the Wednesday [7] next after the feast of St. Gregory in the thirtieth year, as it was said. An inquisition was made by the townships of Walton, Little Raveley, Abbots Ripton and Wennington, who say that they know nothing thereof. And because the townships did not come fully etc. therefore they are in mercy.

A certain doe was found dead of murrain in the field of Alconbury. There was an inquisition, and because the townships of Alconbury,

miseri-cordie. ij marce.

(alibi), Wolfle (dimidia marca) et Etlynton' (j marca) non venerunt plenarie etc. ideo in misericordia.

miseri-cordie. ij marce.

Quidam feto inventus fuit in campo de Elynton' mortuus. Inquisicio facta per villatas Elinton' (alibi), Wlfley (alibi), Alcumbir' (alibi) et Brampton' (ij marce) qui nichil inde sciunt. Et quia non venerunt plenarie, ideo in misericordia.

murdrum infra fin' abbatis de Rames'.[2]

xvj d. exigatur et vtlagetur.

Quidam homo extraneus occisus inuentus fuit in Sappel'. Ricardus Lenueyse forestarius pedes primus inuentor non venit nec fuit attachiatus, quia viridarii dicunt et testantur quod nullum fecerunt attachiamentum de inuentore dicti mortui uel occisi infra metas foreste, scilicet, infra dominicum boscum domini regis, nec vnquam aliquo tempore facere consueuerunt aliquod huiusmodi attachiamentum de inuentore nec de quatuor viscinis; nec aliquam Englescheriam[1] presentauerunt racione assise foreste. Et quia lex terre non debet deleri ut de morte hominis occasione assise foreste procedendum est secundum formam placitorum corone. Nulla Englesscheria, ideo murdrum super hundredum de Hyrstingston'. Et quia inquisicio fuit alias minus sufficienter facta, modo inquiratur per viridarios et quatuor villatas propinquiores, scilicet, Herford', Ripton' Regis, Ripton' Abbatis et Magna Stiuecle, et eciam per totum hundredum de Hyrstingston', qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod dictus Ricardus le Enueise et quidam Willelmus de Cornubia sunt malefactores de morte illa. Et Willelmus fuit extraneus et ignotus et statim post mortem illam recessit, nec actenus rediit, ideo nichil de vtlageria ipsius. Et inquiratur de ipso etc. Et Ricardus exigatur et vtlagetur. Catalla eius sexdecim denarii vnde Iohannes[3] de Marynes vicecomes respondebit.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod homines Hugonis persone de Yrecestr' venerunt in vigilia[4] Epiphanie anno tricesimo cum quatuor leporariis in foresta de Wauberg' qui ouiauerunt hominibus Symonis Maufe, scilicet, Oliuero filio persone et Willelmo de Esseby, qui omnes ceperunt vnum fetonem vnius anni. Et forestarii superuenientes, scilicet, Galfridus de Mortuo Mari, Hugo de Barleye, Symon de Grafha', Iohannes de Copmanford', Ricardus Genitas et Ricardus le Enueyse superuenerunt et ipsos Oliuerum et Willelmum et quendam Hugonem hominem dicti Hugonis persone ceperunt. Et Hugo euasit de manibus dicti Ricardi le Enueise cui fuit traditus ad custodiendum, ipso Ricardo volente et consenciente;

[1] See Publications of the Selden Society, vol. 9, p. xliii. [2] See p. 17, note 3.

[3] John of Mareham was appointed sheriff of Cambridge and Huntingdon on 17 May 1255. See *List of Sheriffs*.

[4] Friday, 5 January 124$\frac{5}{6}$.

Little Stukeley, Woolley and Ellington did not come fully etc., therefore they are in mercy.

A certain fawn was found dead in the field of Ellington. An inquisition was made by the townships of Ellington, Woolley, Alconbury, and Brampton who know nothing thereof. And because they did not come fully to make inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

A certain stranger was found slain in Sapley. Richard Lenveyse the walking forester, who was the first finder, does not come, nor was he attached, because the verderers say and witness that they made no attachment of the finder of the said man who died or was slain within the metes of the forest, to wit, within the king's demesne wood, nor were they wont at any time to make any such attachment of the finder nor of the four neighbours, nor did they present Englishry by reason of the assize of the forest. And because the law of the land concerning the death of a man ought not to be abated on account of the assize of the forest, the procedure must be according to the form of the pleas of the crown. No Englishry, therefore murder upon the hundred of Hurstingstone. And because the inquisition was before insufficiently made, let inquiry be made by the verderers and four neighbouring townships, to wit, Hartford, King's Ripton, Abbots Ripton and Great Stukeley, and also by the whole hundred of Hurstingstone, who say upon their oath that the said Richard Lenveyse and a certain William of Cornwall are guilty of that death. And William was a stranger and unknown, and immediately after that death he went away, and as yet has not returned, therefore nothing of his outlawry; and let inquiry be made concerning him. And let Richard be exacted and outlawed. His chattels are sixteen pence, whereof John of Marcham the sheriff will answer.

It was presented by the foresters and verderers that the men of Hugh the parson of Irchester came on the vigil[4] of the Epiphany in the thirtieth year with four greyhounds into the forest of Weybridge; and they met the men of Simon Maufé, to wit Oliver the son of the parson and William of Ashby, who all took a fawn of a year old. And the foresters coming up, that is to say Geoffrey de Mortemer, Hugh of Barley, Simon of Grafham, John of Coppingford, Richard Genitas, and Richard Lenveyse came up and took the same Oliver and William and a certain Hugh the man of the said Hugh the parson. And Hugh escaped from the hands of the said Richard Lenveyse, to whom he was delivered in custody, the same Richard being willing and consenting; therefore to judgment with the said

iudicium. ideo ad iudicium de dictis forestariis de euasione; et Oliuerus et Willelmus liberati fuerunt Philippo[1] de Stanton' tunc vicecomiti Hunt'; et postea per breue domini regis deliberati fuerunt. Et Oliuerus obiit et fuit essoniatus primo die; ideo nichil de plegiis suis. prisona. Et Willelmus venit et detentus est in prisona. Et attachiatus fuit per Oliuerum de Wolfle (mortuus) et Rogerum le Blund (xij d) de misericordie vj s. eadem, Petrum le Franceis (xij d) de eadem, Iacobum de Weston (xij d) in eadem, Radulfum de Elington' (xij d) de eadem, Reginaldum King (xij d) de eadem, Thomam Attello (xij d) de eadem. Et quia non presentauerunt eum primo die etc. ideo in misericordia. Et quia Hugo persona de Yrecestr' receptauit homines suos qui euaserunt, mandatum. mandatum est episcopo Linc' quod faciat eum venire etc. apud Norhamt' in octabis sancti Iohannis[2] etc. Et Radulfus Resun de Brampton' (xij d), Philippus prepositus de Alcumbir' (iij s), Willelmus Bissop (non est inuentus), Iohannes le Clerc' de Brampton (xij d) et Willelmus Grey de Nidenworth' (xij d) fuerunt plegii predicti miseri-cordia. Ricardi le Enveyse, et modo non habent ipsum, ideo in misericordia. Item plegii eiusdem postea inuenti Nicolaus de Merton' (alibi), Godefridus de Molesworth' (ij s), Radulfus de Brochton' (mortuus) et Henricus de Ripton' Regis (ij s). Postea dictus Willelmus de Esseby [j marca.] venit et finem fecit pro vna marca.[3] Et inuenit plegios 'quod non de cetero' et de dicta marca videlicet Rogerum de Wolfle, Iohannem prepositum de Alcumbir', Iohannem de Wlfl', Iohannem Canu' de eadem, Osbertum filium Ricardi le Clerc' de Weston', Matheum Wlfle, Thomam Attello de eadem, Rogerum le Blund' de eadem, Radulfum de Bustelleys de eadem, Reginaldum le King' de eadem, Iacobum[4] de Weston', Petrum le Franceis. Postea venit apud Norhamt' predictus Hugo persona de Irencestr' et finem fecit pro se et hominibus suis v marce. Non sunt in extractis ad [scaccarium]. per quinque marcas per pleuinam Iohannis Caperun senioris de Siberton' et Willelmi Floribus de Irencestr'.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod Norman Sampson, forestarius eques sub Galfrido de Childewich' tunc senescallo[5] foreste, cepit quendam hominem existentem cum persona de Coleworth' sub Wauberg' infra agistamentum domini regis anno tricesimo octauo; et dictum hominem apud Houton' ad domum Willelmi Dering' hospitis sui super vnam herciam eum ponens magnas penas ei intulit, ita quod dedit ei duodecim denarios ut a dictis penis relaxaretur, et postea dedit ei quinque solidos quod posset sub eo quietus recedere.

Item presentatum est per eosdem de ipso eodem, scilicet, quod

[1] See p. 17, note 5. [2] 1 July 1255. [3] An error for 'Per unam marcam.' [4] MS. 'Jacobus.' [5] See p. 14, note 8.

foresters concerning the escape. And Oliver and William were delivered to Philip of Stanton, who was then sheriff of Huntingdon; and afterwards they were delivered by the king's writ. And Oliver died, and he was essoined on the first day; therefore nothing of his pledges. And William comes and is detained in prison. And he was attached by Oliver of Woolley, and Roger le Blund of the same town, Peter le Franceis of the same town, James of Weston in the same town, Ralph of Ellington of the same town, Reynold King of the same town, Thomas Attello of the same town. And because they did not present him the first day, therefore they are in mercy. And because Hugh the parson of Irchester harboured his men who escaped, an order is sent to the bishop of Lincoln that he cause him to come at Northampton on the octave of St. John [2] etc. And Ralph Resun of Brampton, Philip the reeve of Alconbury, William Bissop, John the clerk of Brampton and William Grey of Needingworth were the pledges of the aforesaid Richard Lenveyse, and now have him not; therefore they are in mercy. And pledges of the same were afterwards found, Nicholas of Merton, Godfrey of Molesworth, Ralph of Broughton and Henry of King's Ripton. Afterwards the said William of Ashby came and made fine by one mark. And he found pledges 'quod non de cetero,' and of the said mark, to wit, Roger of Woolley, John the reeve of Alconbury, John Canun of the same town, Osbert the son of Richard the clerk of Weston, Mathew of Woolley, Thomas Attello of the same town, Roger le Blund of the same town, Ralph of Bustelleys of the same town, Reynold le King of the same town, James of Weston and Peter le Franceis. Afterwards at Northampton came the aforesaid Hugh the parson of Irchester and made fine by five marks for himself and his men by the pledge of John Caperun the elder of Siberton and William of Floore of Irchester.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that Norman Sampson, the riding forester under Geoffrey of Childwick then steward of the forest, took a certain man at Weybridge who was with the parson of Colworth within the time of the agistment of the lord king in the thirty-eighth year; and he took the said man to Houghton to the house of William Dering his host, and he put him upon a harrow, and pained him sorely, so that William gave to him twelve pence that he might be released from the said pains, and afterwards he gave to him five shillings that he might by his aid be able to withdraw quit.

It is presented also by the same persons of the same person that

quidam Norman garcio eiusdem simul cum ipso fuerunt malefactores de venacione domini regis. Et quod idem Norman Sampson vendidit tres quercus in Wauberg'; et quod plures alias fecit transgressiones dum fuit forestarius, ideo mandatum est vicecomiti Warr' etc. quod habeat etc. apud Norhamt' in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste etc. Et quod idem vicecomes etc. quare non habuit etc. apud Hunt' etc. in octabis sancti Barnabe apostoli sicut etc. Postea venit Norman Sampso' apud Norhamt' et fecit finem per duas marcas per pleuinam Henrici de Ludbroc' et Eustachii de Watford', qui habent terras in comitatu Norhamt'.

mandatum est.

ij marce; non sunt in . . . .

[1] Adhuc de venacione.

[2] Quidam feto inuentus fuit in bosco de Brampton' uulneratus quadam sagitta. Inquisicio facta, qui nichil sciunt. Et quia villate de Brampton' (alibi), Elington' (alibi), Grafha' (dimidia marca) et Edelinton'[3] (dimidia marca) non venerunt plenarie; ideo in misericordia.

j marca.

misericordie.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod quidam damus et vna hanchia venacionis et leporarius inuenti fuerunt in domo magistri Henrici tunc rectoris scolarie Huntidon', qui Henricus et Robertus submagister suus pro suspiccione dicte venacionis capti fuerunt et liberati Philippo[4] de Stanton' tunc vicecomiti Hunt'; et de deliberacione nichil ad presens. Et convictum est per viridarios quod predictus Robertus fuit apertus malefactor de venacione cum leporariis; et quod receptatus fuit in domo predicti Henrici qui fuit consenciens malefactis suis de venacione. Et quia clerici sunt nec habent laicum feodum per quod distringi possunt, et R.[5] bone memorie, tunc Linc' episcopus. . . .[6]

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod Radulfus de Holecot' clericus itinerans uersus Hunt' cum vno garcione, qui duxit leporarios. Et euaserunt de manibus suis et prostrauerunt vnum fetonem de etate vnius anni. Quod cum Ricardus Lenveyse forestarius hoc percepisset cum esset prope, cepit dictum Radulfum et garcionem

[1] Roll 5. The pleas on this roll are earlier in date than those on Roll 6, which are printed on pp. 11-21, but the order is reversed, because the scribe wrote the heading of the pleas on Roll 6 instead of on Roll 5. [2] See p. 74.

[3] The reading is clear, but probably Dillington, which is the township mentioned in the inquisition on p. 74, is intended.

[4] See p. 17, note 5.

[5] According to Mathew Paris, Robert Grossetête died on 9 October 1253. See *Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, vol. v. p. 407.

[6] The sentence is unfinished in the original.

a certain Norman his page and he himself were evil-doers to the venison of the lord king, and that Norman Sampson sold three oaks in Weybridge, and committed many other trespasses while he was a forester; therefore an order is sent to the sheriff of Warwick etc. to have etc. at Northampton etc. on the octave of St. John the Baptist etc. And that the same sheriff etc. why he had him not etc. at Huntingdon etc. on the octave of St. Barnabas the Apostle as etc. Afterwards Norman Sampson came to Northampton and made fine by two marks by the pledge of Henry of Ludbrook and Eustace of Watford, who have lands in the county of Northampton.

As yet of the venison.

A certain fawn was found in the wood of Brampton wounded with a certain arrow. An inquisition was made, and the townships know nothing. And because the townships of Brampton, Ellington, Grafham and Dillington did not come fully, therefore they are in mercy.

It was presented by the foresters and verderers that a certain buck and one haunch of venison and a greyhound were found in the house of master Henry then the rector of the school of Huntingdon. And this Henry and Robert his undermaster for suspicion of the said venison were taken and delivered to Philip of Stanton then the sheriff of Huntingdon; and of his delivery nothing at present. And it is proved by the verderers that the aforesaid Robert was an overt evil doer to the venison with greyhounds; and that he was harboured in the house of the aforesaid Henry, who was privy to his evil deeds to the venison, and because they are clerks and have not a lay fee by which they can be distrained, and R. of good memory then bishop of Lincoln. . . .

It was presented by the foresters and verderers that Ralph of Holcot a clerk was journeying towards Huntingdon with a page who led greyhounds. And they escaped from his hands and brought down a fawn of a year old. And when Richard Lenveyse the forester, being near, saw this, he took the said Ralph and his page and the greyhounds;

suum et leporarios qui missi fuerunt domino[1] R. Passel'.[2] Et Radulfus liberatus fuit Philippo[3] de Stanton' tunc vicecomiti Hunt' qui non venit nec de deliberacione sua uel aliorum inprisonatorum tempore preceptum. suo aliquid respondet; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti Hunt' quod capiat etc. quod sit coram iusticiariis de die in diem etc. Et quia viridarii, scilicet, Symon de Copmanford', Iohannes Ballard' de sancto Yuone, Robertus Wyne, et Ricardus Port' et Galfridus[4] de Mortuo Mari tunc senescallus foreste nullam fecerunt mencionem in rotulis suis de nomine dicti garcionis, nec de deliberacione uel euasione sua vnde negocium domini regis quantum ad dictum garcionem penitus misericordie. remanet inperfectum; ideo in misericordia. Et de Radulfo de Holecot' ponitur in respectum usque ad placita apud Norhamt' propter preceptum. absenciam dicti Philippi de Stanton' vicecomitis de quo preceptum est ut supra. Et quia viridarii non debent nec possunt inrotulare in rotulis suis nisi presentacionem forestariorum; et forestarii nichil presentauerunt de predictis; ideo inde quieti. Et ad iudicium de euasione super Galfridum de Mortuo Mari eo quod habet cartam domini regis etc.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod Rogerus le Despens', Willelmus de Linc' et Rogerus venator venerabilis patris R. quondam Linc' episcopi die[5] Sabbati proxima post Ascensionem Domini anno tricesimo primo ceperunt vnum damum in bosco de Dudington'. Et non fuerunt attachiati quia euaserunt antequam exigantur et vtlagentur. capi possent; ideo exigantur et vtlagentur.

Presentatum est quod quidam damus captus fuit in Limining' de qua capcione inquisicio fuit facta per villatas de Grafha' (alibi), Pyrie j marca. (dimidia marca), Elington' (alibi) et Bichamsted' (dimidia marca) qui dicunt quod homines equites et pedites currebant fugando quandam bestiam in Limining'; set nesciebant qui fuerunt. Et quia predicte misericordie. villate non venerunt plenarie ad inquirendum, ideo in misericordia.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod quidam Henricus filius Petri le Noble de Bokeden' et quidam alius ignotus sequuti

[1] It must be remembered that the Latin word 'dominus,' like the English word 'Sir,' did not imply knighthood. Robert Passelewe was not a knight, but a cleric and an archdeacon.

[2] Robert Passelewe acted as justice of the forest south of the Trent about this time, but his appointment is apparently not recorded on the Patent Rolls. He was succeeded in the office by Geoffrey of Langley, who was appointed on 4 March 12$\frac{49}{50}$. (See Patent Roll 59, memb. 7.) Robert Passelewe was also appointed warden of the forests between Stamford bridge and Oxford bridge in succession to Thomas le Mansel by letters patent dated 15 February 124$\frac{5}{6}$. (See Patent Roll 55, memb. 6.)

[3] See p. 17, note 5.

[4] There is no enrolment of the appointment of Geoffrey de Mortemer as steward of the forest, and it is probable that, like Hugh of Goldingham, he was only deputy steward. See p. 11, note 7.

[5] 11 May 1247.

which were sent to Sir Robert Passelewe. And Ralph was delivered to Philip of Stanton then sheriff of Huntingdon, who does not come nor makes answer of his delivery or of the delivery of other persons imprisoned in his time. Therefore the sheriff of Huntingdon is ordered to take etc. that he be before the justices from day to day etc. And because the verderers, to wit Simon of Coppingford, John Ballard of St. Ives, Robert Wynne and Richard Porter, and Geoffrey de Mortemer then the steward of the forest, made no mention in their rolls of the name of the said page, nor of his delivery, nor of his escape, and the business of the king so far as it relates to the said boy is entirely undone, therefore they are in mercy. And of Ralph of Holcot matters are respited until the pleas at Northampton on account of the absence of the said Philip of Stanton the sheriff about whom it was ordered as above. And because the verderers ought not and are not able to enrol anything in their rolls except a presentment of the foresters, and the foresters presented nothing of the matters aforesaid, they are therefore quit thereof. And to judgment with Geoffrey de Mortemer as to the escape, on the ground that he has the king's charter.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that Roger le Despenser, William of Lincoln, and Roger the hunter of the venerable father R. formerly bishop of Lincoln on the Saturday[5] next after Ascension day in the thirty-first year took a buck in the wood of Diddington. And they were not attached because they escaped before they could be taken; therefore let them be exacted and outlawed.

It is presented that a certain buck was taken in Lymage; and an inquisition was made about it by the townships of Grafham, Perry, Ellington and Beechampstead which say that men on horseback and on foot were hunting a certain beast in Lymage; but they did not know who they were. And because the four townships did not come fully to the inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that a certain Henry the son of Peter le Noble of Buckden and a certain other unknown

fuerunt quendam brokettum fugando eum ultra aquam cum duobus leporariis usque villam Offord' Cluny; et ibidem ipsum ceperunt et ipsum secum asportauerunt integrum retro vltra aquam. Et dictus Henricus obiit. Et convictum est per viridarios quod [dictus ignotus vocabatur][1] Rogerus Venator, qui habet terram apud Bukeden, fuit cum

preceptum est.

eo. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod distringat ipsum per terras etc. quod habeat eum de die in diem etc. Et quia villate Offord'

vj marce misericordie.

Cluny (xx s), Offord' Denays (xx s), Gummecestr' (xl s), et Brampton' (alibi) non venerunt plenarie; ideo in misericordia.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod die[2] Martis proxima ante Purificacionem beate Marie anno tricesimo quod[3] due dame capte fuerunt in Sappel'. Inquisicio facta fuit per quatuor

alibi.

villatas Rypton' Abbatis, Magnam Stiuecle, Hereford' et Rypton' Regis, que nichil inde potuerunt inquirere. Et quia villate non venerunt

misericordie.

etc., ideo in misericordia.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod quidam damus inuentus fuit uulneratus in bosco de Brampton'. Et inquisicio facta

alibi.

fuit per quatuor villatas Brampton', Grafha', Dylincton'[4] et Elyngton' que nichil inde sciunt. Et quia villate non venerunt etc.; ideo in

misericordie.

misericordia.

[5] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod quedam bestia capta fuit sub Wauberg' cuius intestina inuenta fuerunt in parco sub Wauberg' per forestarios pedites, scilicet, Robertum de Skipton' et Ricardum le Waleys. Inquisicio facta fuit per villatas propinquiores

alibi. misericordie.

Alcumbir', Wolfle, Elinton' et Brampton' qui nichil aliud inde sciunt. Et quia villate non venerunt etc.; ideo in misericordia.

[6] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod Galfridus filius Stephani Swyft inuentus fuit in haya domini regis de Waberg' die[7] Lune proxima ante festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno tricesimo secundo cum arcu et quinque sagittis barbatis. Et captus per forestarios, scilicet, per Iohannem Bere et Iohannem Prentuit, qui Galfridus statim cognouit se cepisse duos fetones et illos tradidisse Rogero filio Philippi de Alcumbir'. Et quia prisona de Hunt' fuit fracta ductus fuit apud Herford' et traditus per ballium villate de

[1] The words in brackets are interlineated in the MS.

[2] 30 January $124\frac{5}{6}$.

[3] This word is perhaps written in error for 'secundo,' in which case the date of the trespass would be 28 January $124\frac{7}{8}$.

[4] The word 'alibi' in the margin means that the amercement is entered elsewhere in the roll. Thus, where a township is recorded to have been in mercy more than once, an amercement is written above its name in the enrolment of the first offence, and the word 'alibi' is similarly written in the enrolment of subsequent offences. Now, as Dillington has not occurred before, it is probable that the 'alibi' here refers to the word 'Edelinton' on the preceding page.

[5] See p. 74.

[6] See p. 75.

[7] 22 June 1248.

person followed a certain brocket, and hunted it across the water with two greyhounds as far as the town of Offord Cluney; and there they took it and carried the whole of it back again across the water. And the said Henry died. And it is proved by the verderers that the said unknown person who was with him was called Robert the hunter; and he has land at Buckden. And the sheriff is ordered to distrain him by his lands, etc. that he may have him from day to day, etc. And because the townships of Offord Cluney, Offord Darcy, Godmanchester and Brampton did not come fully to the inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that on the Tuesday [2] next before the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the thirtieth year two does were taken in Sapley. An inquisition was made by four townships of Abbots Ripton, Great Stukeley, Hartford and King's Ripton, who could ascertain nothing thereof. And because the townships did not come etc.; therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that a certain buck was found wounded in the wood of Brampton; and an inquisition was made by the four townships Brampton, Grafham, Dillington and Ellington, who know nothing thereof; and because the townships did not come etc.; therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that a certain beast was taken at Weybridge, of which the entrails were found in the park at Weybridge by the walking foresters, that is to say Robert of Skipton and Richard the Welshman. An inquisition was made by four neighbouring townships, Alconbury, Woolley, Ellington and Brampton, who know nothing else thereof; and because the townships did not come etc.; therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that Geoffrey the son of Stephen Swift was found in the king's enclosure of Weybridge on the Monday [7] next before the feast of St. John the Baptist in the thirty-second year with a bow and five barbed arrows. And he was taken by the foresters, that is to say by John Bere and John Prentut. And Geoffrey immediately acknowledged that he had taken two fawns and handed them over to Roger the son of Philip of Alconbury. And because the prison of Huntingdon was broken, he was brought to Hartford, and delivered in bail to the township of Alconbury; and now he does not come; therefore let him be exacted and outlawed; and

exigatur et vtlagetur. Alcumbir'. Et modo non venit; ideo exigatur et vtlagetur; et villata de Alcumbir' in misericordia. Et Rogerus filius Philippi et Philippus pater ipsius convicti de receptamento malefacti sui, capti fuerunt et inprisonati apud Herford', et postea per breue R.[1] Passel' capitalis iusticiarii deliberati fuerunt per pleuinam Iohannis filii Nicolai, Elie Seleg', Nicolai filii Alicie, Willelmi de Aula, Ricardi Gody et perdonatur. aliorum. Et quia non habuerunt primo die etc. (perdonatur); ideo in misericordia. Et[2] Philippus et Rogerus modo veniunt; et detenti sunt in prisona. Postea convictum est per viridarios quod xl s. Iohannes le Bere tunc forestarius cepit duas marcas de Willelmo filio Fabr' de Alcumbir' per sic quod permitteret ipsum abire quietum; gaolle. ideo committitur gaolle. Iterum convictum est per eosdem viridarios quod predictus Willelmus filius Fabr' non fuit culpabilis de aliquo malefacto; ideo inde quietus. Postea venit Iohannes le Bere et finem fecit per vnam marcam pro transgressione. Plegii de dictis tribus marcis Willelmus le Moyne, Symon de Rypton', magister Ricardus de Toleslond', magister Gilbertus de Wepsted, Ricardus de Catteworth', Robertus Freman de Wauton', Willelmus de Catteworth'. Postea venit dicti Philippus et Rogerus. Et Philippus finem fecit per xx s. vnam marcam et Rogerus per dimidiam marcam. Plegii dicti Philippi plegii quod etc. de fine Willelmus de Alcumbir' et Elias le Lord' de eadem. Idem vna cum subscriptis manucapiunt quod non decetero etc. Iohannes filius Nicolai de eadem, Elias Seled de eadem, Willelmus filius Roberti de eadem, Ricardus in Angulo, Elias ad Solium, Ricardus Paie, Rogerus Aldit, Willelmus filius Hugonis, Samuel in Lana, Willelmus Long', Alanus filius Alani. Et plegii dicti Rogeri quod non decetero Willelmus Secrestein de eadem, Nicolaus Tixtor', Henricus Franceis, Nicolaus filius Hawis, Iohannes Canu', Iohannes de Wlfli, Walterus de Eston', Iohannes filius Willelmi, Turstan filius Marg', Simon Kuit, Symon filius Gregor', Stephanus West.

[3] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod duo leporarii secuti fuerunt vnum damum sub haya de Wauberg', set nemo visus fuit cum illis. Tandem quidam Stephanus Fot et Galfridus filius Osberti inuenti fuerunt in campis, quos forestarii ceperunt et duxerunt apud Herford' ad inprisonandum eos ibidem. Et Galfridus euasit a custodia forestariorum; et Stephanus fuit inprisonatus. Postea facta fuit inquisicio per villatas Alcumbir' (alibi), Wolle (alibi), Bokesworth' j marca. (j marca) et Brampton' (alibi) qui nichil inde sciunt nec inquirere potuerunt, cuius leporarii fuerunt; nec predictos Stephanum et Galfridum habuerunt suspectos nec de aliquo malefacto in foresta;

[1] See p. 22, note 2. [2] The word 'quia' is here inserted in the roll. [3] See p. 75.

the township of Alconbury is in mercy. And Roger the son of Philip and Philip the father of this Roger, being convicted of receiving his evil deed, were taken and imprisoned at Hartford; and afterwards, by the writ of Robert Passelewe the chief justice, they were delivered on the pledge of John the son of Nicholas, Elias Selegh, Nicholas the son of Alice, William of the Hall, Richard Gody and others. And because they had them not on the first day, therefore they are in mercy. And Philip and Roger now come, and they are detained in prison. Afterwards it was proved by the verderers that John le Bere, who was then a forester, took two marks from William the son of the smith of Alconbury for permitting him to go quit; therefore he is committed to gaol. Again it is proved by the same verderers that the aforesaid William the son of the smith is not guilty of any evil deed; therefore he is quit thereof. Afterwards John le Bere came and made fine by one mark for his trespass. Pledges of the said three marks, William le Moin, Simon of Ripton, Master Richard of Toseland, Master Gilbert of Wepstead, Richard of Catworth, Robert Freeman of Walton and William of Catworth. Afterwards the said Philip and Roger came; and Philip made fine by one mark, and Roger by half a mark. Pledges of the said Philip for his fine, William of Alconbury and Elias le Lord of the same town. The same persons with the underwritten undertake that he will not in future etc.: John the son of Nicholas of the same town, Elias Selegh of the same town, William the son of Robert of the same town, Richard atte Nook, Elias atte Loft, Richard Paie, Roger Aldit, William the son of Hugh, Samuel Inthelane, William Long and Alan the son of Alan. And the pledges of the said Roger that he will not in future etc. are William Secrestein of the same town, Nicholas the weaver, Henry Franceis, Nicholas the son of Hawis, John Canun, John of Woolley, Walter of Easton, John the son of William, Thurston the son of Margery, Simon Kuit, Simon the son of Gregory and Stephen West.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that two greyhounds followed a buck at the enclosure of Weybridge but nobody was seen with them. At length certain men Stephen Foot and Geoffrey the son of Osbert were found in the fields, and the foresters took them and brought them to Hartford to imprison them there, and Geoffrey escaped from the custody of the foresters, and Stephen was imprisoned. Afterwards an inquisition was made, by the townships of Alconbury, Woolley, Buckworth and Brampton who knew and could ascertain nothing thereof, nor whose were the greyhounds, nor did they hold the aforesaid Stephen and Geoffrey in suspicion of any evil

ideo dictus Stephanus inde fuit quietus coram forestariis et viridariis. Et catalla eius illa occasione confiscata ei liberata fuerunt. Et quia predicte villate non venerunt etc.; ideo in misericordia.

alibi. miseri-cordie.

Regarda-tores.

Henricus de Folkesworth' (pauper), Willelmus Cardun (alibi), Ricardus de Gidding' (dimidia marca), Henricus de Stiuecle (dimidia marca), Vincencius de Stanle (j marca), Simon le Noble (dimidia marca), Radulfus Dyscy de Folkesworth' (dimidia marca), Willelmus Heest de Billington' (ij s), Henricus de Bukesworth' (ij s), Willelmus de Alcumbir' (pauper), Willelmus de Weston' (dimidia marca), Willelmus Heldegar (alibi) regardatores non reddiderunt rotulos suos primo die, ideo omnes in misericordia.

iij marce; dimidia, iiij s. miseri-cordia.

[1] Adhuc de venacione.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod Willelmus Berich' (ij s) hospes Normani Sampson forestarii eques[2] habuit duas filias euntes singulis diebus in Wauberg' et inde portantes siccum et viride apud Hunt' ad uendendum; et inde emerunt cibum dicti Normani; et quod idem Willelmus habuit aueria sua in Wauberg' sicut ei placuit ex permissione dicti Normani. Qui Willelmus venit et non potuit hoc dedicere, ideo committatur gaolle etc.

ij s.

gaolle.

Magister Robertus le Baud' de hospitale Huntind' venit coram iusticiariis et allegauit dicens quod dominus rex non debuit habere attachiamenta de viridi et venacione; et quod nec forestarii neque viridarii debent aliquod attachiamentum inde facere in villa Hunt'; et hoc voluit omni modo sustinere, ita quod propter garulacionem suam curia mota fuit et negocia domini regis inpedita; ideo committitur gaolle. Postea inuenit plegios Gilbertum de Wepston' et Iohannem Russel de Graffha'. Postea taxatur ad dimidiam marcam.

dimidia marca.

* * * * * * *

[3] Villate de Elinton,' Brampton', Parua Stiuecl', et Alcumbir' veniunt et dicunt quod solent et debent habere communam herbagii in Wauberg' ad omnia aueria sua; eo quod terre sue arabiles et prata sua falcabilia extendunt se et abuttant super dominicum boscum domini regis de Wauberg', que terre et prata vastantur per feras domini regis, ita quod nullum inde habent proficuum nec habere possunt; et ea occasione habuerunt communam predictam tempore regum predecessorum domini regis nunc; et eciam anno quinto regni

[1] Roll 5, in dorso. [2] This word is so extended in the roll. [3] Roll 4, in dorso.

deed in the forest; therefore the said Stephen was quit thereof before the foresters and verderers. And his chattels confiscated on that account were delivered to him. And because the aforesaid townships did not come etc.; therefore they are in mercy.

Henry of Folksworth, William Cardun, Richard of Gidding, Henry of Stukeley, Vincent of Stanley, Simon le Noble, Ralph Discy of Folksworth, William Heest of Billington, Henry of Buckworth, William of Alconbury, William of Weston, William Heldegar, the regarders did not render their rolls the first day, therefore all of them are in mercy.

As yet of the venison.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that William Berich the host of Norman Sampson the riding forester had two daughters who go every day to Weybridge and carry therefrom dry and green wood to sell at Huntingdon; and therewith they buy victuals for the said Norman; and that the same William had his beasts in Weybridge as he pleased by permission of the said Norman. And William came and could not deny this, therefore let him be sent to gaol.

Master Robert le Baud of the hospital of Huntingdon came before the justices and alleged that the lord king ought not to have attachments either of vert or of venison; and that neither the foresters nor the verderers ought to make any attachment thereof in the town of Huntingdon. And this he wished to establish in every sort of way, so that by his chatter the court was disturbed and the business of the lord king hindered; therefore he is committed to gaol. Afterwards he found pledges, Gilbert of Wepston, and John Russell of Grafham. Afterwards he is taxed at half a mark.

* * * * * * *

The townships of Ellington, Brampton, Little Stukeley and Alconbury come and say that they are accustomed and ought to have common of herbage in Weybridge for all their beasts, on the ground that their arable lands and their meadows which are fit to be mown extend to and abut upon the lord king's demesne wood of Weybridge; and that their lands and meadows are wasted by the deer of the lord king; so that they have not nor can have any profit therefrom; and on that account they had the aforesaid common in the time of the predecessors of the lord king who now is; and also in the fifth year of

regis nunc fuerunt in seysina donec quidam Walterus[1] filius Roberti tunc senescallus foreste in comitatu Hunt' ipsos eiecit et extra ipsam communam toto tempore suo tenuit; et vnusquisque senescallus post alterum usque nunc eodem modo. Loquendum.

Villate de Herford' et Rypton' Regis dicunt quod solent et debent habere communam herbagii in Sappel' eo quod dicte villate aliquando fuerunt dominica maneria regis; et tunc concessum fuit per reges antecessores regis qui nunc est quod haberent communam dicti herbagii dando inde singulis annis die sancti Iohannis Baptiste pro singulis quatuor aueriis vnum denarium tantummodo; et sic habuerunt communam dicti herbagii tempore regum predecessorum domini regis qui nunc est; et eciam anno regis nunc quinto fuerunt inde in seysina donec quidam Walterus filius Roberti tunc senescallus foreste in isto comitatu ipsos eiecit et extra dictam communam toto tempore suo tenuit; et quilibet senescallus vnusquisque post alterum eodem modo ipsos tenuit. Loquendum.

Willelmus de Upwode bailliuus vicecomitis Hunt' queritur de Thoma de Beyuill' quod cum ipse per preceptum iusticiariorum venisset ad domum dicti Thome ad ipsum distringendum quod veniret cum rotulis patris sui defuncti de tempore quo fuit viridarius regis, et ipse Thomas non esset tunc domi, dixit Reginaldo seruienti ipsius Thome quod venerat occasione predicta et quod scire faceret domino suo, et interim expectaret de ipsa districcione facienda. Quod cum domino suo hoc scire fecisset dominus suus ei remandauit quod non permitteret ipsum Willelmum aliquam districcionem super ipsum facere. Hoc audito, dictus Willelmus dixit quod faceret districcionem ut prius et cepit duos equos occasione predicta. Et dictus Reginaldus seruiens dicti Thome et Gilebertus de Upton' seruiens eiusdem ipsum insequebantur et dictos equos ab eo abstulerunt et eum uerberauerunt et male tractauerunt contra pacem etc. Et profert testes etc.

j marca. Postea de dicto Thoma et hominibus suis vna marca de amerciamento.

Et Reginaldus et Gilebertus[2] veniunt et cognoscunt quod abstulerunt dictos equos sicut predictum est, ideo committuntur in gayola. gaiola. Et dictus Thomas (j marca) manucepit coram vicecomite ad habendum dictos Reginaldum et Gilebertum coram iusticiariis, et non habuit ad horam; ideo in misericordia. misericordia. Et post iudicium venerunt predicti Reginaldus et Gilebertus, ut predictum est.

[1] There is no enrolment of the appointment of Walter the son of Robert on the Patent Rolls.

[2] In place of this word the MS. has 'Willelmus,' which is obviously an error.

the reign of the lord king who now is, they were in seisin until a certain Walter the son of Robert who was then steward of the forest in the county of Huntingdon ejected them and kept them out of that common all his time; and every steward one after another until now kept them out in the same way.

The townships of Hartford and King's Ripton say that they are wont and ought to have common of herbage in Sapley, on the ground that the said townships sometime were demesne manors of the king; and at that time it was granted by the kings, ancestors of the king who now is, that they should have common of the said herbage, giving therefor in every year on the feast of St. John the Baptist for every four beasts one penny only; and so they had common of the said herbage in the time of the kings, predecessors of the king who now is; and also in the fifth year of the king who now is they were in seisin thereof until a certain Walter the son of Robert, who was then steward of the forest in this county, ejected them and kept them out of the said common in all his time; and every steward one after the other kept them out in the same way.

William of Upwood, bailiff of the sheriff of Huntingdon, complains of Thomas de Beyville that, whereas he came by order of the justices to the house of the said Thomas to distrain him to come with the rolls of his father, deceased, of the time when he was the king's verderer, and whereas the said Thomas was not at home, he told Reynold the servant of the same Thomas that he had come for the purpose aforesaid, and that he should inform his lord. and that in the meantime he would wait to make that distress. And when he had made this known to his lord, his lord sent back word that he would not permit this William to make any distress upon him. And when he heard this the said William said that he would make the distress as before, and took two horses for the purpose aforesaid. And the said Reynold the servant of the said Thomas and Gilbert of Upton the servant of the same Thomas followed him, and took the said horses from him and beat him and ill treated him against the peace etc. And he produces witnesses.

Afterwards of the said Thomas and his men a mark for an amercement.

And Reynold and Gilbert come and acknowledge that they took away the said horses as is aforesaid; therefore they are sent to gaol. And the said Thomas undertook before the sheriff to have the said Reynold and Gilbert before the justices, and he had them not at the appointed time, therefore he is in mercy. And after judgment the aforesaid Reynold and Gilbert came as is aforesaid.

V (a).[1]

PLACITA FORESTE IN COMITATU NORTHAMT' CORAM W. LE BRITON', NICHOLAO DE ROMES', GALFRIDO DE LEUCKNOR' ET SYMONE DE TROP IUSTICIARIIS AD PLACITA FORESTE IN CRASTINO[2] SANCTI IOHANNIS BAPTISTE ANNO REGNI REGIS HENRICI TRICESIMO NONO.

. . . .

Rokenham.

[3] Adhuc de venacione in balliua de Roginham.

Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios et convictum quod die[4] Martis in festo Gule Augusti anno vicesimo nono, cum Henricus de sancto Licio et alii forestarii vidissent malefactores in foresta cum arcubus et sagittis et super ipsos hutesium leuassent, villata de Wadenho noluit venire nec sequi hutesium; ideo qui presentes sunt de eadem villa committuntur prisone, et tota villata in graui misericordia. Inquisicio fuit facta de dictis malefactoribus per quatuor propinquiores villatas, Audewincle, Wadenho, Pylketon' et Lyueden', que nichil inde inquirere potuerunt; et quia non venerunt plenarie ad inquirendum, ideo in misericordia. Et testatum est quod Wadenho veniens ad inquirendum, noluit respondere ad aliquam inquisicionem; ideo in misericordia ut prius. Et quia dicti malefactores perrexerunt ad loggiam cuiusdam Willelmi filii Willelmi le Messer de Wadenho et nichil inde voluit dicere; ideo inuenit plegios veniendi coram iusticiariis. Et modo non venit, ideo plegii in misericordia, videlicet, Robertus Neubond et Robertus Stannard' de Wadenho. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat etc. dictum Willelmum. Postea venit Willelmus et requisitus qui essent dicti malefactores, qui dicit quod nescit et preceptum est quod custodiatur.

misericordia.

misericordie.

preceptum.

Presentatum est et convictum per forestarios et viridarios quod die[5] Sabbati proxima post festum sancti Dyonisii anno vicesimo nono quidam coerus percussus fuit quadam sagitta in parco de Bricstok'; et tres homines visi fuerunt sequentes dictum coerum. Et forestarii non ausi fuerunt exclamare dictos malefactores. Et dicti forestarii euntes et querentes auxilium et, quando redierunt, inuenerunt dictum

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 68. [2] Friday, 25 June 1255.
[3] Roll 3. [4] August 1245. [5] 14 October 1245.

V (a).

PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON BEFORE WILLIAM LE BRETON, NICHOLAS OF ROMSEY, GEOFFREY OF LEWKNORE AND SIMON OF THORP JUSTICES FOR PLEAS OF THE FOREST ON THE MORROW[2] OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST IN THE THIRTY-NINTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY.

. . . .

As yet of the venison in the bailiwick of Rockingham.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers and proved that on Tuesday[4] the feast of the Gule of August in the twenty-ninth year, when Henry de Senlis and other foresters had seen evil doers in the forest with bows and arrows and had raised the hue upon them, the township of Wadenhoe refused to come and follow the hue, therefore those from the same town who are present are committed to prison, and all the township is in grievous mercy. An inquisition was made concerning the said evil doers by the four neighbouring townships Aldwinkle, Wadenhoe, Pilton and Lyveden who could ascertain nothing thereof. And because they did not come fully to the inquisition, therefore they are in mercy. And it is witnessed that Wadenhoe came to the inquisition but refused to make answer; therefore it is in mercy as before. And because the said evil doers proceeded to the lodge of a certain William the son of William the reaper of Wadenhoe, and he refused to say anything thereof, therefore he found pledges of coming before the justices. And now he does not come, therefore his pledges are in mercy, to wit Robert Newbond and Robert Stannard of Wadenhoe. And the sheriff is ordered to cause the said William to come etc. Afterwards the said William came, and being asked who the said evil doers were, says that he does not know; and it is ordered that he be kept in custody.

It is presented and proved by the foresters and verderers that on the Saturday[5] next after the feast of St. Denis in the twenty-ninth year a certain soar was struck with a certain arrow in the park at Brigstock; and three men were seen following the said soar; and the foresters did not dare to hail the said evil doers. And the said foresters went and sought aid; and when they returned they found

coerum mortuum et ligatum super quandam arborem. Inquisicio facta per quatuor villatas propinquiores Geytinton', Stanern', Bricstok' et Buton', que nichil inde potuerunt inquirere. Et quia non venerunt plenarie etc.; ideo in misericordia.

misericordie.

Presentatum est per eosdem quod Willelmus de Forestal forestarius in balliua de Ferma, suspectus de malefactis venacionis, attachiatus fuit; et modo venit. Et Robertus Basset', Ricardus de Audewinchel' et Iohannes Leueth' viridarii dicunt quod non est culpabilis nec suspectus de aliquo malefacto; ideo inde quietus. Et quia presentauerunt in rotulis suis primo ipsum Willelmum suspectum, et modo penitus ipsum aquietant, ideo responsuri domino regi de redempcione dicti Willelmi. Item viridarii quieti quia alibi.

[1] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod die [2] Mercurii in crastina sanctorum Philippi et Iacobi cum Willelmus de Norhamt' et Rogerus de Tingewik' venissent de placitis de Stanerne eundo uersus Rowell' datum fuit eis intelligi quod bersatores fuerunt in landa de Benifeld'. Et statim dicti Willelmus et Rogerus et Iacobus de Torleberg' et Matheus frater eius, forestarii equites, et forestarii pedites cum eis cum festinancia iuerunt illuc vt dictos bersatores caperent; qui cum venirent in foresta dicti malefactores dictos forestarios insultauerunt et dictum Matheum, fratrem dicti Iacobi de Torleberg' forestarii, bersauerunt, ita quod dictus Matheus inde obiit. Et dicti malefactores tunc uersi fuerunt in fugam. Et propter noctis obscuritatem et bosci spissitudinem non potuerunt persequi, ita quod euaserunt. Et facta fuit inquisicio per quatuor villatas propinquiores, Stoke, Carleton', Magna [3] Acle et Corby que dixerunt quod dicti malefactores visi fuerunt cum arcubus et sagittis et balistis et leporariis, et quod euaserunt set non potuerunt inquirere qui fuerunt. Et quia dicte villate non venerunt etc., ideo in misericordia.

misericordie

[4] Item, postea facta fuit inquisicio inde coram vicecomite per milites et probos homines qui nichil aliud inde potuerunt inquirere; set dictus Iacobus de Torleberg' frater dicti Mathei occisi dixit quod vidit leporarios Symonis de Kyuelmworth' vbi frater suus occisus, ob quod idem Symon fuit captus et inprisonatus apud Norhamt' tempore Alani [5] de Maydewill' tunc vicecomitis. Et quia nullus respondit de deliberacione dicti Symonis, ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat Iohannem filium Alani qui habet custodiam terre et

preceptum.

[1] See p. 79.
[2] 2 May 1246.
[3] The adjectives 'magna' and 'parua' are often treated as indeclinable when forming part of place names.
[4] See p. 81.
[5] Alan of Maidwell was sheriff of the county of Northampton from 2 November 1242 till 14 June 1248. See *List of Sheriffs*.

the said soar dead and bound to a certain tree. An inquisition was made by four neighbouring townships Geddington, Stanion, Brigstock and Boughton who could ascertain nothing thereof; and because they did not come fully etc., therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the same persons that William of Foresthill, the forester in the bailwick of Farm, being suspected of evil deeds to the venison, was attached; and now he came. And Robert Basset, Richard of Aldwinkle and John Lovet, the verderers, say that he is not guilty nor is he suspected of any evil deed; therefore he is quit. And because they presented in their rolls on the first day that William was suspected and now they entirely acquit him, therefore they must answer to the lord king for the ransom of the said William. Item, the verderers are quit, because the amercement is elsewhere.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on Wednesday[2] the morrow of St. Philip and St. James when William of Northampton and Roger of Tingewick had come from the pleas of Stanion and were going towards Rothwell they were given to understand that poachers were in the lawn of Beanfield. And forthwith the said William and Roger and James of Thurlbear and Matthew his brother, the riding foresters, and the walking foresters came with all haste to that place so that they might take the said poachers. And when the foresters came into the forest, the said evil doers attacked them, and shot Matthew the brother of the said James of Thurlbear the forester so that the said Matthew died thereof. And then the said evil doers turned and fled. And on account of the darkness of the night and the thickness of the wood the foresters could not follow them, so that they escaped. And an inquisition was made by four neighbouring townships, Stoke, Carlton, Great Oakley and Corby, who said that the said evil doers were seen with bows and arrows and crossbows and greyhounds, and that they escaped, but that they could not ascertain who they were. And because the said townships did not come etc., therefore they are in mercy.

Item, afterwards an inquisition was made thereof before the sheriff by knights and good men, who could ascertain nothing else thereof; but the said James of Thurlbear, the brother of the said Matthew who was slain, said that he saw the greyhounds of Simon of Kivelsworthy at the place where his brother was slain; on account of which the said Simon was taken and imprisoned at Northampton in the time of Alan of Maidwell, who was then the sheriff. And because nobody makes answer as to the delivery of the said Simon, therefore the sheriff is ordered that he cause John the son of Alan, who has

heredis dicti Alani etc. Et Symon venit et convictum est quod leporarii dicti Symonis alias set non tunc ducti fuerunt per ipsum causa malefaciendi in foresta, ideo committitur prisone. Postea venit Symon et finiuit per vnam marcam per pleuinam Iohannis Louet de Risston' et Colini de Harlawe.

prisone j marca.

[1] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod Iohannes filius Stephani Cut captus fuit cum vno fetone. Modo venit et optulit se et detentus est in prisona. Et testatum est quod alias fuit in prisona tempore Alani de Maydewill' tunc vicecomitis. Et nullus etc. pro eo; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti ut supra. Postea venit Iohannes predictus filius Stephani Cut; et testatum fuit quod invenit dictum fetonem mortuum et quod fuit iuuenis, et ignorans malicie cepit illum; et fuit in prisona per annum et amplius; et perdonatur redempcio pro rege.

preceptum.

perdonatur pro rege.

[2] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod quedam bissa inuenta fuit mortua in pratis de Acle. Inquisicio fuit facta per Magna Acle, Parua Acle, Neuton' et Corby, que nichil inde inquirere potuerunt nisi quod mortua fuit murina. Et quia villate non venerunt etc.; ideo in misericordia.

misericordie.

[3] Presentatum est per eosdem quod Hugo Swargar et Henricus Tocke de Brickstok' attachiati fuerunt pro suspicione laqueorum positorum sub parco de Bricstok' ad lepores capiendos per Galfridum Sworgar', Hugonem filium Godwini, Gilbertum[4] ad Stangnum, Petrum filium Ade, Henricum filium Ricardi, Henricum filium Geruas', Iohannem de Lortebrok', Matheum Croyle, Ricardum filium Roberti, Henricum de Lortebrok', Robertum de Suburg' et Henricum prepositum. Et quia non habuerunt ipsos Hugonem et Henricum primo die etc., ideo in misericordia. Et testatum est quod dicti Hugo et Henricus posuerunt se in fugam quando forestarius voluit eos attachiare, noluerunt stare recto, et quod fuerunt culpabiles de predictis laqueis. Et modo veniunt, ideo detenti in prisona.

misericordie.

prisona.

[5] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod die[6] Martis proxima post Epiphaniam anno tricesimo primo quod quidam[7] homines capti fuerunt portantes venacionem in quodam sacco in villa de Suburg'. Inquisicio fuit inde facta per quatuor villatas propinquiores, scilicet, Suburg', Luffwic', Bricstock' et Lyueden' que non venerunt plenarie etc., ideo in misericordia. Et convictum est quod Radulfus filius Mabil' de Suburg' et Willelmus filius Henrici de Banifeud' et

misericordia.

[1] See p. 81.

[2] See p. 82.

[3] See p. 83.

[4] MS. 'Gilbertus.'

[5] See p. 84.

[6] 8 January 124$\frac{6}{7}$.

[7] The word 'quod' is carelessly inserted before this word in the original.

the custody of the land and heir of the said Alan, to come etc. And Simon comes and it is proved that the greyhounds of the said Simon were led there by him at another time, but not then, for the sake of evil doing in the forest, therefore he is committed to prison. Afterwards Simon came and made fine by half a mark by the pledge of John Lovet of Rushton and Colin of Harlow.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that John the son of Stephen Cut was taken with a fawn. Now he came and offered himself, and he is detained in prison. And it is witnessed that he was at another time in prison in the time of Alan of Maidwell, who was then sheriff; and nobody makes answer as to him; therefore the sheriff is ordered as above. Afterwards the aforesaid John the son of Stephen Cut came; and it was witnessed that he found the said fawn when it was already dead; and that he was young and took the fawn without evil intent; and that he was in prison for a year and more; and his ransom is pardoned on behalf of the king.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that a certain hind was found dead in the meadows of Oakley. An inquisition was made by Great Oakley, Little Oakley, Newton and Corby, who could ascertain nothing thereof except that it died of murrain. And because the townships did not come etc., therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that Hugh Swartgar and Henry Tuke of Brigstock, being suspected of nets placed in the park of Brigstock for taking hares, were attached by Geoffrey Swartgar, Hugh the son of Godwin, Gilbert atte Pool, Peter the son of Adam, Henry the son of Richard, Henry the son of Gervais, John of Lortebrook, Mathew Croyle, Richard the son of Robert, Henry of Lortebrook, Robert of Sudborough and Henry the reeve. And because they had not the same Hugh and Henry on the first day etc., therefore they are in mercy. And it is witnessed that the said Hugh and Henry fled and, when the forester wished to attach them, refused to stand to right; and that they were guilty concerning the aforesaid nets. And now they come; therefore they are detained in prison.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on the Tuesday [6] next after the Epiphany in the thirty-first year that certain men were taken carrying venison in a certain sack in the town of Sudborough. An inquisition was made thereof by four neighbouring townships, to wit Sudborough, Lowick, Brigstock and Lyveden, who did not come fully etc.; therefore they are in mercy. And it is proved that Ralph the son of Mabel of Sudborough and William the

Robertus de Grafton' habuerunt dictam venacionem quorum Radulfus
et Willelmus predicti capti fuerunt et in prisona apud Norhamt'
tempore Alani de Maydewill', qui nichil de deliberacione etc.; ideo
preceptum. preceptum est vicecomiti etc. vt supra. Et ipsi Radulfus et Willelmus
prisona. predicti et alii modo veniunt; et iterum detenti sunt in prisona. Et
Robertus de Grafton' nec venit nec fuit attachiatus, quia non fuit
vtlagetur. inventus; ideo exigatur et vtlagetur. Set quedam Agnes Cornet
cuius manupastus fuit invenerat plegios habendi eum coram iusti-
ciariis etc. scilicet Hugonem filium Rogeri et Petrum filium Rogeri.
Et modo non habent ipsum, ideo in misericordia. Postea testatum
est quod Willelmus filius Henrici coactus et inuitus, portabat dictam
venacionem. Et quia diu fuit in prisona et nichil habet in bonis;
quietus. ideo inde quietus.

[1] Presentatum est per eosdem quod die [2] Lune proxima ante festum
beati Mathie apostoli anno tricesimo primo Henricus filius Geruasii
piscatoris de Yslep' captus fuit in parco de Bricstok' cum arcu et
sagittis, qui indictauit Radulfum filium Roberti filii Quenyl de socie-
tate et ipsum Robertum de receptamento. Idem Henricus indictauit
quendam Walterum filium Geruas' piscatoris de Yslep' et Willelmum
filium Henrici de Drayton' de societate. Et dictus Henricus filius
Geruasii, Robertus filius Quenyl, Radulfus filius suus et Willelmus
filius Henrici de Drayton' modo veniunt. Et convictum est quod
gaolle. culpabiles sunt de malefactis venacionis; ideo committuntur gaolle.
Et Walterus filius Geruasii piscatoris de Yslep' non venit, et fuit
attachiatus per Hugonem le Peynt', Henricum de Sutton', Radulfum
le Peynt', Adam de Yslep' et Iohannem filium Godwin'; ideo omnes
preceptum. in misericordia. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire etc.
dictum Walterum filium Geruasii etc. Postea convictum est quod
Robertus filius Willelmi de Lufwic' est culpabilis de malefactis
prisona. venacionis, qui venit et detentus est in prisona.

[3] Adhuc de venacione in balliua de Rokenham.

[4] Presentatum est per eosdem quod die [5] Lune proxima post festum
sancti Michaelis anno tricesimo secundo capud coeri cerui inventum
fuit in magna trenchia inter Bricstok' et Lyueden'. Inquisicio fuit

[1] See p. 85. [2] 18 February 124$^{6}_{7}$. [3] Roll 3, in dorso.
[4] See p. 86. [5] 5 October 1248.

son of Henry of Benefield and Robert of Grafton had the said venison; of whom the aforesaid Ralph and William were taken and put in the prison at Northampton in the time of Alan of Maidwell who makes no answer concerning their delivery etc.; therefore the sheriff is ordered etc. as above. And the aforesaid Ralph and William and the others now come and are again detained in prison. And Robert of Grafton does not come, and he was not attached because he was not found; therefore let him be exacted and outlawed. But a certain Agnes Cornet, whose mainpast he was, had found pledges of having him before the justices etc., to wit Hugh the son of Roger and Peter the son of Roger; and now they have him not; therefore they are in mercy. Afterwards it is witnessed that William the son of Henry carried the said venison under coercion and against his will; and because he was a long time in prison and has no goods, therefore he is quit thereof.

It is presented by the same persons that on the Monday [2] next before the feast of the Blessed Mathias the apostle in the thirty-first year Henry the son of Gervais the fisher of Islip was taken in the park of Brigstock with a bow and arrows; and he indicted Ralph the son of Robert the son of Quenyl of complicity and Robert himself of harbouring. The same Henry indicted a certain Walter the son of Gervais the fisher of Islip and William the son of Henry of Drayton of complicity. And the said Henry the son of Gervais, Robert the son of Quenyl, Ralph his son and William the son of Henry of Drayton now come; and it is proved they are guilty of evil deeds to the venison; therefore they are committed to gaol. And Walter the son of Gervais the fisher of Islip does not come and he was attached by Hugh the painter, Henry of Sutton, Ralph the painter, Adam of Islip and John the son of Godwin; therefore all are in mercy. And the sheriff is ordered to cause to come etc. the said Walter the son of Gervais etc. Afterwards it is proved that Robert the son of William of Lowick is guilty of evil doing to the venison; and he comes and is detained in prison.

As yet of the venison in the bailiwick of Rockingham.

It is presented by the same persons that on the Monday [5] next after the feast of St. Michael in the thirty-second year the head of a hart's soar was found in the great trench between Brigstock and Lyveden.

facta per quatuor villatas Lyuenden', Bricstok', Suburg', Luffwic', que nichil inde inquirere potuerunt. Et quia willate non venerunt plenarie ad inquisicionem, ideo in misericordia.

misericordia.

[1] Presentatum est per eosdem quod die [2] Veneris proxima ante Purificacionem beate Marie anno tricesimo secundo quidam ceruus mortuus fuit, percussus quadam sagitta, et mortuus fuit inuentus in Lytlehawe. Inquisicio facta fuit per quatuor villatas Carleton', Magna Acle, Risston' et Coddinham. Et quia villate non venerunt plenarie etc., ideo in misericordia. Et villata de Cotingha' noluit venire coram viridariis etc. Et fuit attachiata per Petrum le Breton' de Cotingha' et Willelmum Curlewald' de eadem; ideo in misericordia.

misericordia

misericordie.

[3] Presentatum est per eosdem quod proximo die [4] Dominica ante Dominicam Palmarum anno tricesimo secundo Walterus de Grey miles et quatuor homines sui equites et Willelmus clericus et alii quorum nomina ignorantur transierunt per Landam de Benyfeld' ducentes leporarios; qui leporarii cuccurerunt ad vnam herdiam bestiarum set nichil ceperunt. Quod cum forestarii percepissent, ipsos insultauerunt et ceperunt dictum Willelmum Clericum, Iohannem hominem suum et quendam Ricardum de Aslacby qui missi fuerunt apud Rokenha' ad inprisonandum. Et postea R. Passel',[5] tunc iusticiarius foreste, mandauit Willelmo Norhamt',[6] tunc senescallo foreste, quod quia Alanus de Wassond' et Thomas de Kirkeby fecerunt ipsum securum habendi dictos Ricardum, Willelmum et alios coram iusticiariis proximo itinerantibus apud Norhamt' quod ipsos deliberaret dum tamen non essent capti cum venacione. Et dicti Ricardus et alii modo non veniunt; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat etc. de die in diem Walterum de Grey. Et quod ipse habeat etc. predictos et alios de manupasto suo etc. Postea venit Walterus de Grey et Ricardus de Aselakeby clericus in crastino [7] sancti Michaelis et detenti sunt in prisona. Postea dictus Walterus finem fecit pro se et pro hominibus suis per triginta marcas per plegium Ricardi Basset et Henrici de la Wade.

xxx marce.

memorandum.

[8] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod die [9] Pasche anno tricesimo tercio Symon de Ouerton', persona de Wauld', cepit vnum capriolum. Et dictus Symon modo non venit; ideo mandatum est

mandatum episcopo.

[1] See p. 87. [2] 31 January 124$\frac{7}{8}$.

[3] See p. 87.

[4] 5 April 1248; but the first 'Dominica' is probably written in error for 'Sabbati.'

[5] See p. 22, note 2.

[6] William of Northampton must have been deputy steward. Robert Passelewe was himself bailiff or steward of the forest at this time.

[7] On this day the justices were sitting to hear pleas relating to other forests in the county of Northampton. See *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 70.

[8] See p. 89. [9] 4 April 1249.

An inquisition was made by four neighbouring townships, Lyveden, Brigstock, Sudborough and Lowick, who could ascertain nothing thereof; and because the townships did not come fully to the inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the same persons that on the Friday[2] next before the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-second year a certain hart was found, struck with a certain arrow, and dead in Littlehawe. An inquisition was made by four townships, Carlton, Great Oakley, Rushton and Cottingham. And because the townships did not come fully etc.; therefore they are in mercy. And the township of Cottingham refused to come before the verderers etc. And it was attached by Peter le Breton of Cottingham and William Curlewald of the same town; therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the same persons that on the Sunday[4] next before Palm Sunday in the thirty-second year Walter de Grey knight and four of his men on horseback, and William his clerk and others whose names are not known crossed the lawn of Beanfield leading greyhounds, which ran after a herd of beasts, but they took none of them. And when the foresters had seen this, they attacked the men, and took the said William the clerk, John his man and a certain Richard of Aslackby, who were sent to Rockingham to be imprisoned. And afterwards Robert Passelewe, then justice of the forest, sent orders to William of Northampton, then steward of the forest, that, since Alan of Wassand and Thomas of Kirkby had made him sure of having the said Richard, William and the others before the justices next in eyre at Northampton, he should deliver them, provided that they were not taken with venison. And the said Richard and the others now do not come; therefore the sheriff is ordered that he cause to come etc. from day to day Walter de Grey; and that he have the aforesaid men and others of his mainpast etc. Afterwards Walter de Grey and Richard of Aslackby come and are detained in prison. Afterwards the said Walter made fine for himself and his men by thirty marks on the pledge of Richard Basset and Henry de la Wade.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on Easter day[9] in the thirty-third year Simon of Overton the parson of Old took a roe. And the said Simon now does not come; therefore an

episcopo Lync' etc. quod venire faciat etc. Postea persona de Waude taxatur ad centum solidos.

[1] Presentatum est per eosdem quod die [2] Iouis in festo sancti Iohannis ante portam Latinam anno tricesimo tercio Rogerus filius Laur' de Wadeho captus fuit cum arcu et sagittis in foresta; inprisonatus apud Norhamt' et deliberatus per breue domini regis. Et modo non venit; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod inquirat et faciat eum venire etc. Postea venit dictus Rogerus et testatum est quod non quietus. fuit malefactor; ideo inde quietus.

[3] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod Willelmus Mauclerc de Lyueden' est malefactor de venacione domini regis in foresta prisona. cum trappis. Venit et detentus est in prisona.

[4] Presentatum est per eosdem quod die [5] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Michaelis anno tricesimo quinto malefactores inventi fuerunt cum arcubus et sagittis et tribus canibus in bosco de Ferma de Bricstok'. Circiter duodecim de quibus malefactoribus duo ceperunt quendam Robertum de Wike, venatorem domini G. de Langl' [6] iusticiarii foreste, et ipsum ligauerunt ad vnam quercum, et postea permiserunt eum abire. Inquisicio facta fuit qui essent dicti malefactores et nichil potuit inquiri per villatas, set quidam Ricardus le Harpur dixit quod Willelmus le Despens' domini Nicholai de Bassingburn, Willelmus filius Iohannis Helle (quietus), Willelmus de Houton' de familia dicti Nicholai, Robertus de Fugeres, qui aliquando fuit cum eodem Nicholao, et nunc est cum Warino de Bassingburn' in comitatu Cantebr'; ideo mandatum est vicecomiti Cantebr' quod distringat dictum Warinum quod habeat etc. die [7] Sabbati proxima post octabas apostolorum Petri et Pauli. Et convictum est quod predicti Willelmus le Despens' (j marca), Willelmus de Houton et Robertus de Fugeres interfuerunt predicto malefacto. Et Willelmus le Despens' venit et detentus est in prisona. Et Robertus non venit; ideo ut supra etc. Et Willelmus de Houton non venit et fuit attachiatus per Robertum filium Rogeri de Benifeld', Henricum le Feure, Galfridum Megre, Robertum Kidenoc, Henricum Kyte, Iordanum de Vptorp', Willelmum filium prepositi, Hugonem filium Matild', Robertum [8] filium Inge, Willelmum filium Alani, Benedictum [9] Sutor, et Robertum [8] misericordie. Mayden, omnes de Benefeud', ideo in misericordia. Et Willelmus de vtlagetur. Houton' exigatur et vtlagetur. Postea Willelmus le Despens' venit et j marca. finiuit [per] vnam marcam per pleuinam Willelmi Arnold' de Walkel'.

[1] See p. 89.
[2] 6 May 1249.
[3] See p. 90.
[4] See p. 99.
[5] 4 October 1251.
[6] See p. 22, note 2.
[7] 11 July 1255.
[8] MS. 'Robertus'
[9] MS. 'Benedictus.'

order is sent to the bishop of Lincoln etc. that he cause him to come etc. Afterwards the parson of Old is taxed at one hundred shillings.

It is presented by the same persons that on Thursday [2] the feast of St. John before the Latin Gate in the thirty-third year Roger the son of Lawrence of Wadenhoe was taken with a bow and arrows in the forest; he was imprisoned at Northampton and delivered by the writ of the lord king; and now he does not come; therefore the sheriff is ordered to make inquiry and cause him to come; etc. Afterwards the aforesaid Roger comes, and it is witnessed that he was not an evil doer; therefore he is quit thereof.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that William Mauclerc of Lyveden is an evil-doer to the venison of the lord king in the forest with traps. He comes and is detained in prison.

It is presented by the same persons that on the Wednesday [5] next after the feast of St. Michael in the thirty-fifth year evil doers were found with bows and arrows and three dogs in the wood of Brigstock Farming. And two out of about twelve of these evil doers took a certain Robert of Wick, the hunter of Sir Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest, and bound him to an oak; and afterwards they permitted him to depart. An inquisition was made as to who were the said evil doers and nothing could be ascertained by the townships, but a certain Richard the Harper said that [they were] William the spenser of Sir Nicholas of Bassingbourn, William the son of John Helle, William of Houghton of the household of the said Nicholas, Robert de Feugères, who was sometime with the same Nicholas, and now is with Warin of Bassingbourn in the county of Cambridge; therefore an order is sent to the sheriff of Cambridge to distrain the said Warin to have him etc. on the Saturday [7] next after the octave of the apostles Peter and Paul. And it is proved that the aforesaid William the spenser, William of Houghton and Robert de Feugères were present at the aforesaid evil deed. And William the spenser comes and is detained in prison. And Robert does not come; therefore as above etc. And William of Houghton does not come, and he was attached by Robert the son of Roger of Benefield, Henry the smith, Geoffrey Meagre, Robert Kidenoc, Henry Kyte, Jordan of Upthorp, William the son of the reeve, Hugh the son of Maud, Robert the son of Inge, Walter the son of Alan, Bennet the cobbler and Robert Mayden, all of Benefield; therefore all are in mercy. And let William of Houghton be exacted and outlawed. Afterwards William the spenser came and made fine by one mark by the pledge of William Arnold of Walkley. Afterwards Robert de Feugères came

Postea venit Robertus de Fugers et finiuit per vnam marcam per pleuinam Willelmi de Scaccario et Willelmi de Camera.

misericordia. [1] Dimidia quarteria glandis inventa fuit in domo Colini de Karleby; et non habuit warantum; ideo in misericordia, per pleuinam Willelmi Helle et Ricardi de Patteshull'; finiuit per tres solidos per eandem pleuinam.

prisona. Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod Rogerus Rastel, Petrus filius Hugonis de Grafton' sunt malefactores venacionis domini regis. Et presentes detenti in prisona. Postea venit Rogerus Rastel et finiuit per vnam marcam per pleuinam Philippi Fabr' de Rowell', Ricardi de Maydewell', Ricardi filii Walkelin' et Thome filii Petri de eadem. Postea venit dictus Petrus et finiuit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Willelmi filii Henrici et Ricardi filii Henrici de Grafton'.

[2] Adhuc de venacione in balliua de Rokenham.

prisona. Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod die [3] Dominica post festum apostolorum Petri et Pauli anno tricesimo quarto Willelmus le Carbon' de Geytinton' invenit vnum damum mortuum et detulit illum secum ad hospicium suum. Et inde misit vnam partem Radulfo ad pontem de Geytinton' et aliam partem Iohanni Aaron de eadem. Et dicti Willelmus, Iohannes et Radulfus veniunt, et super hoc convicti detenti sunt in prisona.

iiij sol. [4] Presentatum est per eosdem et convictum quod Robertus le Noble capellanus de Suburg' fuit apertus malefactor venacionis, qui captus fuit et euasit de manibus forestariorum. Et modo non venit quia mortuus. Catalla eius confiscata fuerunt et liberata Hugoni le Noble de Suburg', scilicet, quatuor solidi de quibus respondebit.

[5] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod Rogerus Russel de Aiswell' captus fuit cum vno capriolo in foresta et Willelmus filius Oseberti cum eo. Et inprisonati apud Norhamt'. Et modo non veniunt. Et dies fuit eis prefixus per iusticiarios eo quod dictus Rogerus est de hospicio domini regis.

[6] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod die [7] Dominica proxima post Inuencionem sancte Crucis anno tricesimo quinto Robertus de Corby, Galfridus Gos de eadem et Robertus filius Godefridi capti fuerunt cum malefactis venacionis et inprisonati apud

[1] See p. 101.
[2] Roll 4.
[3] 3 July 1250.
[4] See p. 94.
[5] See p. 95.
[6] See p. 96.
[7] 7 May 1251.

and made fine by one mark by the pledge of William of the exchequer and William of the chamber.

Half a quarter of mast was found in the house of Colin of Carlby; and he had no warrant; therefore he is in mercy by the pledge of William Helle and Richard of Pattishall; he made fine by three shillings by the same pledge.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Roger Rastel and Peter the son of Hugh of Grafton are evil doers to the king's venison. And being present they are detained and imprisoned. Afterwards Roger Rastel came and made fine by one mark by the pledge of Philip the smith of Rothwell, Richard of Maidwell, Richard the son of Walkelin and Thomas the son of Peter of the same town. Afterwards the said Peter came and made fine by half a mark by the pledge of William the son of Henry and Richard the son of Henry of Grafton.

As yet of the venison in the bailiwick of Rockingham.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that on the Sunday [3] next after the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul in the thirty-fourth year William the charcoal burner of Geddington found a dead buck, and brought it with him to his house. And he sent part thereof to Ralph atte Bridge of Geddington, and the rest to John Aaron of the same town. And the said William, John and Ralph come, and being convicted of this are detained in prison.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that Robert le Noble, the chaplain of Sudborough, was an overt evil doer to the venison. He was taken and escaped from the hands of the foresters. And now he does not come, because he is dead. His chattels were confiscated and delivered to Hugh le Noble of Sudborough; to wit four shillings, for which he will answer.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Roger Russell of Ashwell was taken with a roe in the forest; and William the son of Osbert was with him. And they were imprisoned at Northampton; and now they do not come; and a day was fixed for them by the justices on the ground that the said Roger is of the household of the lord king.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on the Sunday [7] next after the Invention of the Holy Cross in the thirty-fifth year Robert of Corby, Geoffrey Gos of the same town and Robert the son of Godfrey were taken with the proceeds of their evil deeds to the

Norhamt'. Et Robertus de Corby modo venit et convictus detentus est in prisona. Et dicti Galfridus et Robertus filius Godefridi non veniunt, et fuerunt inprisonati apud Norhamt' tempore Roberti Basset tunc vicecomitis qui presens est. Dicit quod Robertus filius Godefridi et Robertus Gos convicti fuerunt de latrocinio coram Galfrido de Leuekenor,[1] iusticiario ad gaollam deliberandam de Norhamt' assignato, et per iudicium suspensi. Et dictus Galfridus presens est et bene cognouit quod coram eo fuerunt convicti, ut predictum est. Et dicit quod tunc fuerunt presentes forestarii et vicecomes et nullam fecerunt mencionem quod essent imprisonati pro transgressione venacionis. Et Robertus Basset,[2] tunc vicecomes, non potest hoc dedicere; ideo ad iudicium de eo. Et dictus Robertus de Corby alias inprisonatus dedit domino regi duas marcas et dimidiam pro essendo[3] sub pleuina usque aduentum iusticiariorum, de quibus Hugo de Maneby vicecomes est responsurus.

prisona. ad iudicium. ij marce dimidia.

[4] Presentatum est per eosdem quod die[5] Natiuitatis beate Marie anno tricesimo quinto R. de Clar' comes Gloc' fuit apud Rowell'. Et post prandium iuit ad boscum suum de Mikelwod' spaciaturus; et ibidem fecit decopulare duos brachettos qui inuenerunt vnum ceruum in eodem bosco; et illum fugauerunt usque in campum de Deseburg' supra Rowell'; et ibi captus fuit. Cuius capcioni interfuit Robertus de Mares cum tribus leporariis, Robertus Basset cum tribus leporariis, Robertus de Longo campo et Iohannes Louet viridarius qui comederant cum dicto comite eo die; ideo de dicto comite coram rege; et ad iudicium de predictis Roberto, Roberto, Roberto et Iohanne. Et quia tota villata de Rowell' fecit stabliam coram dicto ceruo quando captus fuit; ideo ad iudicium.

coram rege. ad iudicium.

[6] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod in crastino[7] conuersionis sancti Pauli anno tricesimo sexto quod Iohannes de Somerset' qui fuit cum Petro de Stanford' de familia domini regis cepit duas damas et vnum fetonem in Hassokes in parco de Bricstok'; ideo coram rege.

coram rege.

[8] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod die[9] Veneris proxima post Conuersionem sancti Pauli anno predicto Perinus quidam clericus de elemosinaria domini regis cepit vnam damam in foresta.

[1] Geoffrey of Lewknor and three other justices were directed by letters patent to deliver the gaol of Northampton on 26 May 1251. (See Patent Roll 60, memb. 9 in dorso.) He was also one of the justices now hearing these pleas. See p. 27.

[2] Robert Basset was appointed sheriff of the county of Northampton on 15 May 1250, and continued in office till 23 April 1252. See *List of Sheriffs*.

[3] MS. 'essendi.'

[4] See p. 98.

[5] Friday, 8 September 1251.

[6] See p. 103.

[7] Friday, 26 January 125½.

[8] See p. 103.

[9] 26 January 125½.

venison and imprisoned at Northampton. And Robert of Corby now comes, and being convicted is detained in prison. And the said Geoffrey and Robert the son of Godfrey do not come; and they were imprisoned at Northampton in the time of Robert Basset, who was then the sheriff, and who is now present. He says that Robert the son of Godfrey and Robert Gos were convicted of theft before Geoffrey of Lewknor, a justice assigned for delivering the gaol of Northampton, and by judgment they were hanged. And the said Geoffrey is present and well acknowledges that they were convicted before him as is aforesaid. And he says that there were then present the foresters and the sheriff, who made no mention of the fact that they were imprisoned for trespass to the venison. And Robert Basset who was then sheriff cannot deny this; therefore to judgment with him. And the said Robert of Corby, who was previously imprisoned, gave to the king two and a half marks for being under pledge till the coming of the justices; and of these Hugh of Manby, the sheriff, will make answer.

It is presented by the same persons that on the day [5] of the Nativity of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-fifth year Richard of Clare, earl of Gloucester, was at Rothwell. And after dinner he went to his wood of Micklewood to take a walk, and there he caused to be uncoupled two braches, which found a hart in the same wood. And they chased it as far as the field of Desborough above Rothwell; and it was taken there. And at the taking there were present Robert de Mares, with three greyhounds, Robert Basset with three greyhounds, Robert de Longchamp and John Lovet the verderer, who had dined with the said earl on that day. Therefore as to the said earl, let the matter be dealt with before the king; and as to the said Robert, Robert, Robert and John, to judgment with them; and because the whole township of Rothwell beset the said hart, when it was taken, therefore to judgment with it.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on the morrow [7] of the Conversion of St. Paul in the thirty-sixth year John of Somerset, who was with Peter of Stamford, one of the king's household, took two does and one fawn in Hassokes in the park of Brigstock; therefore let the matter be dealt with before the king.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on the Friday [9] next after the Conversion of St. Paul in the year aforesaid Perrin, a certain clerk of the king's almonry, took a doe in the forest. And because he was of the king's household, therefore let

coram rege. Et quia fuit de familia domini regis, ideo coram rege. Et quia villate de Stok', Wyberdeston', Brampton' et Deresburg' non venerunt plenarie ad inquirendum, ideo in misericordia. misericordie.

[1] Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod Galfridus Catel de Bricstok' est malefactor venacionis in foresta; qui venit et detentus est in prisona. prisona. Et alias captus fuit pro eodem et inprisonatus apud Norhamt'; et tempore Alani de Maydewill' vicecomitis deliberatus fuit per breue per pleuinam Ricardo ad viuarium de Bricstok', Girardo filio Roberti de eadem, Hugoni filio Willelmi de eadem, Iohanni filio Ingerami de eadem, Henrico filio Ricardi de eadem, Henrico filio Hugonis de eadem; et quia non habuerunt eum primo die etc.; ideo in misericordia. misericordia.

Presentatum est et convictum per eosdem quod die [2] Iouis proxima ante festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno tricesimo octauo vna bestia capta fuit sub sepe castri de Rokenham, per homines persone de Eston'. Inquisicio fuit facta per quatuor villatas propinquiores, scilicet, Rokenham, Corby, Gretton' et Keten'; et quia non venerunt plenarie etc., ideo in misericordia. Et forestarii statim post capcionem dicte bestie insidiantes per totam noctem vigilando in crastina summo mane in aurora diei inuenerunt tres homines et tres leporarios, quorum ceperunt vnum hominem nomine Rogerum filium Edwardi de Wodeneuton' cum duobus leporariis qui missus fuit ad prisonam apud Norhamt' tempore Hugonis de Maneby tunc vicecomitis. Et fuit deliberatus per breue; et mortuus est et essoniatus de morte; ideo nichil de plegiis suis. Postea testatum est quod dicti leporarii et dictus Rogerus defunctus et alii quorum nomina ignorantur fuerunt cum Roberto Bacun persona [3] de Eston' in comitatu Linc', ideo mandatum est episcopo Linc' etc. quod faciat etc. mandatum. die [4] Sabbati proxima post octabas apostolorum Petri et Pauli. Et quia Iohannes Louet dedixit rotulum suum dicendo quod dicta bestia que fuit capta erat quedam ouis, et super hoc per viridarios, forestarios et alios socios suos convictus est, ideo in prisona. prisona. Et predicti duo homines scilicet Robertus persona, clericus et Gilbertus ianitor castri de Rokenham, qui fugerunt, postea redierunt. Per breue domini E. de Bosco,[5] tunc iusticiario foreste, deliberati fuerunt per ballium Radulfo Hutting'. Et postea testatum est quod inquisicio fuit facta inde coram predicto E. de Bosco, que inquisicio aquietauit predictos homines et leporarios; ideo nichil de ipsis nec de plegiis eorum.

[1] See p. 106. [2] 13 June 1254. [3] MS. 'persone.' [4] 10 July 1255. [5] See p. 15, note 2.

the matter be dealt with before the king. And because the townships of Stoke, Wilbarston, Brampton and Desborough did not come fully to make inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Geoffrey Catel of Brigstock is an evil doer to the venison in the forest. He comes and is detained in prison. And he was previously taken for the same offence, and was imprisoned at Northampton. And in the time of Alan of Maidwell the sheriff he was delivered by writ on pledge to Richard atte Pond, Gerald the son of Robert, Hugh the son of William, John the son of Ingram, Henry the son of Richard, and Henry the son of Hugh, all of Brigstock. And because they had him not the first day etc., therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on the Thursday [2] next before the feast of St. John the Baptist in the thirty-eighth year a beast was taken beneath the hedge of the castle of Rockingham by the men of the parson of Easton. An inquisition was made by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Rockingham, Corby, Gretton and Cotton; and because they did not come fully etc.; therefore they are in mercy. And the foresters immediately after the taking of the said beast lay in ambush and kept watch through the whole night. On the following morning at daybreak they found three men and three greyhounds; of whom they took one man, Roger the son of Edward of Woodnewton by name, with two greyhounds. And he was sent to prison at Northampton at the time when Hugh of Manby was sheriff; and he was delivered by writ; and he is dead and is essoined of death; therefore nothing of his pledges. Afterwards it is witnessed that the said greyhounds and the said Roger deceased and the others, whose names are unknown, were with Robert Bacon, the parson of Easton in the county of Lincoln; therefore an order is sent to the bishop of Lincoln etc. that he cause etc. on the Saturday [4] next after the octave of the apostles Peter and Paul. And because John Lovet contradicted his roll by saying that the said beast, which was taken, was a certain sheep, and of this by the verderers, foresters and others of his fellows is convicted; therefore to prison with him. And the aforesaid two men, to wit, Robert the parson, a clerk, and Gilbert the doorkeeper of Rockingham castle, who fled, afterwards returned. They were delivered by the writ of Arnold de Bois, then justice of the forest, on bail to Ralph Hutting. And afterwards it is witnessed that an inquisition was made thereof before the aforesaid Arnold de Bois; and the inquisition acquitted the aforesaid men and the greyhounds; therefore nothing of them, nor of their pledges.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Radulfus Holeweye cepit vnam bestiam cum qua Willelmus de Calwendon' ouiauit[1] ei. Et dictus Radulfus fugit et euasit. Et non fuit attachiatus quia non inuentus. Et modo non venit, ideo exigatur et vtlagetur.

exigatur et vtlagetur.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod die[2] Purificacionis beate Marie anno tricesimo nono Nicolaus de sancto Mauro et quatuor scutarii eiusdem Nicolai ceperunt vnum damum in landa de Benifeud'. Non potuit inquiri de nominibus dictorum scutariorum. Idem Nicolas cepit vnam damam die Iouis sequenti in Swayteshal'; et modo non venit, ideo preceptum vicecomiti quod venire faciat dictum Nicolaum etc.

preceptum.

[3] Adhuc de venacione in balliua de Rokenham.

[4] Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Henricus le Neue de Islep', Salomon de Acle et Symon filius Rogeri de Geytinton' sunt malefactores venacionis. Et Henricus et Symon veniunt; et detenti sunt in prisona. Et Salomon non venit; nec fuit attachiatus quia non inuentus, ideo exigatur et vtlagetur. Postea venit Symon filius Rogeri et finiuit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Nicolai filii Willelmi de Geitinton'. Item postea venit Henricus Neue et finiuit per viginti solidos per pleuinam Galfridi pistoris de Neuton'. Et dictum est quod predictus Salomon rettatus est coram iusticiariis itinerantibus; et ideo preceptum vicecomiti quod illum capiat si inueniri poterit.

exigatur et vtlagetur. dimidia marca. xx s.

[5] Presentatum est per eosdem quod quedam bestia deberet occidi et asportari de foresta. Inquisicio facta fuit inde per quatuor villatas propinquiores que nichil inde inquiri potuerunt. Et quia Torp Underwode summonita noluit venire etc., ideo in misericordia.

misericordia.

[6] Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Walterus et Nicolaus filii Sweyn et Symon wodewardus Mauricii de Andely ceperunt vnam bestiam et portauerunt illam ad domum Walteri Pate de Pilketon' et ibidem ad nupcias eiusdem Walteri eam comederunt. Et dicti Nicolaus, Walterus, et Symon veniunt et detenti sunt in prisona.

prisona.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Walterus filius Roberti Percheued est malefactor de venacione in foresta. Modo venit et detentus est in prisona.

prisona.

[1] The form 'ouiare' for 'obuiare' is elsewhere used in these rolls. See p. 19.

[2] Tuesday, 2 February $125\frac{4}{5}$.

[3] Roll 4, in dorso.

[4] See p. 109.

[5] See p. 111.

[6] See p. 112.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that Ralph Holway took a beast, with which William of Calwendon met him. And the said Ralph fled and escaped. And he was not attached, because he was not found. And now he does not come; therefore let him be exacted and outlawed.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that on the day[2] of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-ninth year Nicholas of St. Maur and four esquires of the same Nicholas took a buck in the lawn of Beanfield. The names of the said esquires could not be ascertained. The same Nicholas took a doe on the Thursday following in Swayteshall; and now he does not come; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause the said Nicholas etc.

As yet of the venison of the bailiwick of Rockingham.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Henry le Neve of Islip, Solomon of Oakley and Simon the son of Roger of Geddington are evil doers to the venison. And Henry and Simon come; and they are detained in prison. And Solomon does not come; and he was not attached, because he was not found, therefore let him be exacted and outlawed. Afterwards came Simon the son of Roger and made fine by half a mark by the pledge of Nicholas the son of William of Geddington. And afterwards came Henry le Neve and made fine by twenty shillings by the pledge of Geoffrey the baker of Newton. And it is said that the aforesaid Solomon is accused before the justices in eyre; and therefore the sheriff is ordered to take him if he can be found.

It is presented by the same persons that a certain beast is said to have been killed and carried away from the forest. An inquisition was made thereof by the four neighbouring townships, who could ascertain nothing thereof. And because Thorpe Underwood was summoned and refused to come etc., therefore it is in mercy.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Walter and Nicholas the sons of Sweyn and Simon the woodward of Maurice Daundelay took a beast, and carried it to the house of Walter Pate of Pilton, and there eat it at the wedding of the same Walter. And the said Nicholas, Walter and Simon come and are detained in prison.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Walter the son of Robert Perchead is an evil doer to the venison in the forest. He comes now and is detained in prison.

Quia compertum et inrotulatum fuit in rotulo de inquisicionibus quas E. de Bosco,[1] iusticiarius foreste, fecit in balliua de Stanerne quod Hugo de Goldinham,[2] senescallus foreste sub G. de Langel' iusticiario foreste, et subscripti scilicet Symon de Acly, Willelmus filius dicti Hugonis, Robertus clericus dicti Hugonis, Willelmus Munford', Walterus Basset, Philippus Oldbare, Radulfus le Wudeward', Petrus Pakeden' per ipsum Hugonem vna cum eo multas et maximas transgressiones venacionis, viridis, pannagii et aliarum transgressionum fecerunt in foresta. Et Hugo, presens, requisitus qualiter uelit se acquietare de isto crimine ei et aliis predictis inposito, petit quod inquiratur per viridarios, scilicet, Radulfum de Thychemers', Ricardum de Audewincle, Willelmum de Camera, Willelmum Clifard' et Robertum filium Rogeri, Willelmum de Couesgraue, Robertum Mantel, Willelmum de Brampteston', Ricardum de Selueston', Willelmum le Brun de Couesgraue et regardatores et omnes milites et libere tenentes, qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Hugo nec alii non sunt culpabiles de aliqua transgressione nec maxime de transgressionibus eis inpositis coram E. de Bosco. Dicunt enim quod willate de Geytynton', et Brystok', Stanerne et Acle odio et hatya illud crimen falso dicto Hugoni et aliis inposuerunt; ideo inde quieti. quieti.

[3] Presentatum est per forestarios et viridarios quod die[4] Martis proxima ante Natiuitatem beate Marie anno tricesimo nono Colynus de Geytinton', Rogerus Caperun forestarius pedes, Willelmus Bolle forestarius pedes, Willelmus de Wyrmitton' iunior, Russel homo Benedicti forestarii et Robertus custos de Langel' interfuerunt capcioni duarum bestiarum in bosco de Geytinton' et quod Hugo Kydelomb de Geytinton' et Thomas filius Rogeri de eadem fuerunt consencientes predictis malefactoribus et partem suam de dictis bestiis habuerunt; et quod predictus Hugo Kydelomb tulit scapulas et duo colla predicte venacionis ad domum vicarii de Geytinton'; et Laurencius Bolman, dispensarius dicti vicarii, dictas scapulas et colla ad opus domini sui recepit. Et Colynus, Willelmus Bolle, Rogerus Caperun, Hugo Kydelomb', et Thomas filius Rogeri et Ricardus de Horton' veniunt et detenti sunt in prisona. Et quia Iohannes Rimnold de Abpthrop, prisona. Gilbertus filius Ade de eadem, Ricardus Leffet de eadem, Rogerus Alflet de eadem, Ricardus filius prepositi de eadem, Robertus de

[1] See p. 15, note 2.

[2] See p. 11, note 7, and p. 22, note 2. Geoffrey of Langley was succeeded in the office of justice of the forest south of Trent by Reynold de Moyon, who was appointed by letters patent dated 25 October 1252 (Patent Roll 61, m. 1). Geoffrey was also steward or bailiff of the forest between Stamford bridge and Oxford bridge, having been appointed by letters patent dated 24 April, 1250 (Patent Roll 59, m. 6). Hugh of Goldingham must have been his deputy steward.

[3] See p. 11, note 7.

[4] 7 September 1255.

Because it was found and enrolled in the roll of inquisitions which Arnold de Bois, justice of the forest, made in the bailiwick of Stanion, that Hugh of Goldingham, steward of the forest under Geoffrey of Langley, justice of the forest, and the underwritten, to wit, Simon of Oakley, William the son of the said Hugh, Robert the clerk of the said Hugh, William Munford, Walter Basset, Philip Oldbare, Ralph the woodward, Peter Pakeden by the assent of the same Hugh and with him did many and great trespasses to the venison, vert, pannage and other things in the forest. And Hugh, who is present, on being asked how he wished to acquit himself of that charge which had been imputed to him and the others aforesaid, demands that an inquiry be made by the verderers, to wit, Ralph of Titchmarsh, Richard of Aldwinkle, William of the chamber, William Clifard and Robert the son of Roger, William of Cosgrove, Robert Mantel, William of Braunston, Richard of Silverstone, William le Brun of Cosgrove and the regarders, and all the knights and free tenants; who say upon their oath that the aforesaid Hugh and the others are not guilty of any trespass; and in particular are not guilty of the trespasses imputed to them before Arnold de Bois. For they say that the townships of Geddington, and Brigstock, Stanion and Oakley imputed that charge to the said Hugh and the others falsely and out of hatred; therefore they are quit.

It is presented by the foresters and verderers that on the Tuesday [4] next before the Nativity of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-ninth year Colin of Geddington, Roger Caperun, walking forester, William Bolle, walking forester, William of Warmington the younger, Russell, the man of Benedict the forester, and Robert the keeper of Langley, were present at the taking of two beasts in the wood of Geddington; and that Hugh Kydelomb of Geddington and Thomas the son of Roger of the same town were privy to the acts of the aforesaid evil doers, and had their share of the said beasts; and that the aforesaid Hugh Kydelomb took the shoulders and two necks of the aforesaid venison to the house of the vicar of Geddington; and that Lawrence Bolman, the spenser of the said vicar, received the said shoulders and necks for the use of his lord. And Colin, William Bolle, Roger Caperun, Hugh Kydelomb and Thomas the son of Roger and Richard of Horton come, and are detained in prison. And because John Rimnold of Apethorp, Gilbert the son of Adam of the same town, Richard Leffet of the same town, Roger Aflet of the same town, Richard the son of the reeve of the

Wedon' de eadem fuerunt plegii Willelmi Bolle forestarii de fidelitate etc. et modo est conuictus de transgressione venacionis etc., ideo omnes in misericordia. Et quia Rogerus de Bereford', Willelmus de Salond',[1] Rogerus le Franceys, Henricus Tuk' de Bristok', Rogerus de Lane de eadem fuerunt plegii Rogeri Caperun forestarii de fidelitate etc. et modo est conuictus de transgressione venacionis etc., ideo omnes in misericordia. Postea venit Radulfus vicarius de Geytinton' et testatum est per viridarios quod dictus Laurencius dictam venacionem, ipso Radulfo nesciente, recepit. Et quia non habet Laurencium manupastum suum, in misericordia. Postea finem fecit pro se et pro dicto Laurencio per vnam marcam per pleuinam Symonis clerici de Bouton' et Rogeri filii Willelmi de eadem.

V (b).[2]

PLACITA FORESTE IN COMITATU NORHAMPT' IN CRASTINO[3] SANCTI MICHAELIS ANNO REGNI REGIS HENRICI FILII REGIS IOHANNIS QUINQUAGESIMO SEXTO CORAM ROGERO DE CLIFFORD MATHEO DE COLUMBAR' NICHOLAO DE ROMES' ET REGINALDO DE AKLE IUSTICIARIIS AD EADEM PLACITA AUDIENDA ET TERMINANDA ASSIGNATIS.

. . . .

[4] Adhuc de venacione de Rokingham.

Presentatum est etc. quod Simon filius Willelmi Tuluse, Ricardus de Ewyas, garcio Willelmi Tuluse, Willelmus de Wotton' (alibi) Radulfus de Drayton', capellanus apud Wotton', Simon de Hamslepe, garcio predicti Simonis, Alanus filius Hugonis de Lofwyk', wodewardus Roberti de Nowers de bosco suo de Bulax, Iohannes Messias de Lofwyk', Robertus Pette de Lofwyk', Radulfus Yuelhering' de eadem, Robertus de Grafton', Henricus de Drayton', et alii de societate eorum, inquirendum. de quorum nominibus inquirendum, intrauerunt forestam predictam die[5] Mercurii in festo sancti Bartholomei anno quinquagesimo sexto cum arcubus et sagittis, et fuerunt bersantes in eadem foresta per totum diem predictum, et occiderunt tres feras sine warento, et abciderunt

[1] The true reading of this name is very doubtful.
[2] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 72.
[3] 30 September 1272.
[4] Roll 6 in dorso.
[5] 24 August 1272.

same town and Robert of Weedon of the same town were pledges of William Bolle the forester as to his fealty etc., and he is now convicted of a trespass to the venison, therefore they are all in mercy. And because Roger of Barford, William of Salond, Roger le Franceis, Henry Tuke of Brigstock and Roger of Lane were pledges of Roger Caperun the forester as to his fealty etc., and now he is convicted of a trespass to the venison, therefore they are all in mercy. Afterwards Ralph, the vicar of Geddington, came, and it is witnessed by the verderers that the said Lawrence received the said venison, without the knowledge of the same Ralph; and because he has not Lawrence his mainpast, he is in mercy. Afterwards he made fine for himself and for the said Lawrence by one mark by the pledge of Simon the clerk of Boughton and Roger the son of William of the same town.

V (b).

PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF NORTHAMPTON ON THE MORROW[3] OF ST. MICHAEL IN THE FIFTY-SIXTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY THE SON OF KING JOHN, BEFORE ROGER OF CLIFFORD, MATTHEW DE COLOMBIÈRES, NICHOLAS OF ROMSEY AND REYNOLD OF OAKLEY, JUSTICES ASSIGNED FOR HEARING AND DETERMINING THE SAME PLEAS.

. . . .

As yet of the venison of Rockingham.

It is presented etc. that Simon the son of William Tuluse, Richard of Ewyas, the page of William Tuluse, William of Wootton, Ralph of Drayton, the chaplain at Wootton, Simon of Hanslope, the page of the aforesaid Simon, Alan the son of Hugh of Lowick, the woodward of Robert de Nowers of his wood of Bulax, John Messias of Lowick, Robert Pette of Lowick, Ralph Iuelhering of the same town, Robert of Grafton, Henry of Drayton and others of their company, whose names are to be ascertained, entered the forest aforesaid on Wednesday[5] the feast of St. Bartholomew in the fifty-sixth year with bows and arrows; and they were shooting in the same forest during the whole of the day aforesaid and killed three deer without warrant, and they cut off the head of a buck and put it

capud vnius dami et posuerunt illud super vnum pelum in medio cuiusdam trenchie, que vocatur Harleruding', inponendo in os predicti capitis quendam[1] fucellum; et fecerunt illud iniare contra solem in magnum contemptum domini regis et forestariorum suorum; et forestarii, ex eis tandem percepti, ipsos exclamauerunt; et ipsi malefactores ad eos saggittauerunt contra pacem domini regis; et forestarii, hutesio in eis leuato, fugierunt nec eis resistere potuerunt. Predicti Ricardus de Ewyas, Alanus, Radulfus, Robertus et Henricus venerunt; et super hoc conuicti detenti sunt in prisona. Et predicti Simon Tuluse et Simon, garcio eius, non venerunt; ideo mandatum est vicecomiti Berk' quod faciat eos venire die[2] Lune proxima ante festum apostolorum Simonis et Iude. De predicto Willelmo de Wotton' preceptum est superius. Et de predicto Radulfo capellano mandatum est episcopo Linc' quod faciat eum venire in festo[3] apostolorum Simonis et Iude. Et predicti Robertus Pette et Iohannes Messias non sunt inventi; ideo exigantur etc. Et quia predictus Alanus, wodewardus iuratus, fuit malefactor de venacione; ideo per assisam foreste predictus boscus de Bulax, quem custodiuit, capiatur in manum domini regis.

prisona. mandatum. mandatum episcopo Linc'. exigantur. capiatur.

Postea inquisitum est et conuictum per omnes viridarios tocius foreste in comitatu Norhamt' quod Radulfus de Heyes, balliuus comitis Warwyk' apud Hampslap' et qui habet terras apud Benstede iuxta Aulton' in comitatu Suhamt', Rogerus, Radulfus et Thurstanus filii Iohannis filii Iohannis de Hampslap', Henricus filius persone de Blithesworthe, Willelmus Wolfrich de Wyke homo Simonis Tuluse, Walterus homo Willelmi Tulouse et Thomas, qui fuit filius capellani de Blithesworthe, simul cum omnibus supradictis ex prouidencia consilio precepto et assensu Willelmi Tulouse intrauerunt forestam de Rokingeham predicto die[4] Mercurii in festo sancti Bartholomei et per duos dies precedentes; et occiderunt octo feras ad minus et vnam damam, ut predictum est, cuius capud predictus Simon Toluse abcidit et super pelum posuit; et predictus Ricardus Dewyas posuit billettum in gulam eius; et venacio predictarum octo ferarum in carecta Radulfi Vuelhering cariata fuit a foresta vsque Stanwygge; et ibidem fuit per vnam noctem ad domum Galfridi Russel, ipso non existente domi, nec aliquid inde sciente; et exinde cariata fuit apud Hamslap' ad domum predicti Willelmi Toluse et Simonis, filii sui, qui hoc totum fieri fecerunt; et ibi dicta venacio partita et commesta fuit; et quod dum predicti malefactores fuerunt in foresta circa predictam vena-

[1] MS. 'quandam.'
[2] 24 October 1272.
[3] 28 October 1272.
[4] 24 August 1272.

on a stake in the middle of a certain clearing, which is called Harleruding, placing in the mouth of the aforesaid head a certain spindle; and they made the mouth gape towards the sun, in great contempt of the lord king and of his foresters. And the foresters, when they were at last perceived by them, hailed them; and the evil doers shot at them against the peace of the lord king. And the foresters, after raising the hue upon them, fled and could not resist them. The aforesaid Richard of Ewyas, Alan, Ralph, Robert and Henry came; and being convicted of this they are detained in prison. And the aforesaid Simon Tuluse and Simon his page did not come; therefore an order is sent to the sheriff of Berks that he cause them to come on the Monday[2] next before the feast of the apostles Simon and Jude. As to the aforesaid William of Wootton an order is given above. And as to the aforesaid Ralph the chaplain an order is sent to the bishop of Lincoln that he cause him to come on the feast[3] of the apostles Simon and Jude. And the aforesaid Robert Pette and John Messias are not found; therefore let them be exacted etc. And because the aforesaid Alan, the sworn woodward, was an evil doer with respect to the venison, therefore by the assise of the forest let the aforesaid wood of Bulax, which he had in custody, be taken into the hands of the lord king.

Afterwards an inquisition is held and it is proved by all the verderers of all the forest of Northampton that Ralph of Heyes the bailiff of the earl of Warwick at Hanslope, who has lands at Binsted near Alton in the county of Southampton, Roger, Ralph and Thurstan the sons of John the son of John of Hanslope, Henry the son of the parson of Blisworth, William Wolfrich of Wick the man of Simon Tuluse, Walter the man of William Tuluse and Thomas who was the son of the chaplain of Blisworth, with all the above mentioned persons, by the provision, counsel, order and assent of William Tuluse entered the forest of Rockingham on the aforesaid Wednesday[4] the feast of St. Bartholomew and during the two preceding days and killed eight deer at least, and a doe, as is aforesaid, whose head the aforesaid Simon Tuluse cut off and put upon a stake. And the aforesaid Richard of Ewyas put a billet in its throat. And the venison of the aforesaid eight deer was carried from forest in the cart of Ralph Iuelhering as far as Stanwick; and it rested there for one night at the house of Geoffrey Russell, he himself not being at home, nor knowing anything thereof; and from thence it was carried to Hanslope to the house of the aforesaid William Tuluse and Simon his son, who had caused all this to be done; and there the aforesaid venison was divided and eaten. And it is proved that while the aforesaid evil

cionem perquirendam per tres dies supradictos receptati fuerunt ad
domos Alani le Gaunter de Cotes et Roberti de Lyndesye in Lufwyk',
ipsis ad hoc consencientibus. Et postea venit Robertus de Nodar' et
j marca. finiuit pro bosco suo rehabendo per vnam marcam ; plegii Simon de
Watervile et Robertus Greleng. Postea venit Alanus le Gaunter et
detentus est in prisona. Postea venit Henricus filius persone de
prisona. Blytheswortlie et detentus est in prisona. Et predictus Thomas
prisona. filius capellani venit et detentus est in prisona.

. . . .

[1] **De venacione parci et warenne Norhamt'.**

Presentatum est et conuictum per Walterum de Boketun', Willelmum filium Willelmi de Westun', Ricardum Griffin de eadem, Robertum filium Alexandri de Byllinge, Iohannem de Boketon', Henricum le Flemeng', Willelmum filium Roberti de Boketon', Ricardum de Berners de Moleton', Radulfum Hupehulle de eadem, Robertum le Freman de Oueston, Andream de Magna Byllinge, et Andream le Freman de Parua Billinge ; qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod inter bellum de Lewes et Euesham[2] tempore quo Petrus[3] de Monteforti habuit custodiam castri et parci de Norhamt' Robertus comes de Ferar' et familiares sui vi et contra voluntatem et sine scitu ipsius Petri fregit murum parci versus Moleton' et intrauit eum cum canibus et leporariis suis et
coram rege. cepit quatuor feras et asportauit sine warento ; coram rege quia baro.

Presentatum est etc. quod Willelmus filius Warini tempore quo
Warinus[4] de Basingeburn' habuit custodiam predicti parci et warenne
cepit in eadem warenna quatuor lepores sine warento. Et non venit
preceptum. nec fuit attachiatus ; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eum
venire apud Huntingdon' in crastino[5] sancti Hillarii. De predicto
x libre. Willelmo decem libre.[6]

[1] Roll 7, in dorso.

[2] The battle of Lewes was fought on 14 May 1264, and that of Evesham on 4 August 1265.

[3] By letters patent dated 7 June 1264 Peter de Montfort, junior, was appointed warden of Rockingham castle, 'with its appurtenances' (Patent Roll 80, m. 12). It is probable that the appurtenances included the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford and the park of Northampton. On 17 June in the same year Nicholas of Seagrave was appointed warden of the castle of Rockingham and the forest between the two bridges (Patent Roll 80, m. 11).

[4] Warin of Bassingbourn was appointed warden of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford by letters patent dated 17 February $126\frac{5}{6}$ (Patent Roll 83, m. 28).

[5] 14 January $127\frac{2}{3}$.

[6] In all charters of warren granted by the king to his subjects there were provisions which made trespassers in them liable to a forfeiture of ten pounds. From this entry it would appear that trespassing in the king's warrens involved a similar forfeiture.

doers were in the forest obtaining the aforesaid venison during the three days above mentioned they were harboured at the houses of Alan le Gaunter of Cotes and Robert of Lindsay in Lowick, who were privy to this. And afterwards Robert de Nowers came and made fine for having his wood again by one mark; his pledges were Simon of Waterville and Robert Grenleng. Afterwards Alan le Gaunter came, and was detained in prison. Afterwards Henry the son of the parson of Blisworth came and was detained in prison. And the aforesaid Thomas the son of the chaplain came and was detained in prison.

. . . .

Of the venison of the park and warren of Northampton.

It is presented and proved by Walter of Boughton, William the son of William of Weston, Richard Griffin of the same town, Robert the son of Alexander of Billing, John of Boughton, Henry the Fleming, William the son of Robert of Boughton, Richard de Berners of Moulton, Ralph Uphill of the same town, Robert the Freeman of Overstone, Andrew of Great Billing and Andrew the Freeman of Little Billing; who say upon their oath that between the battles of Lewes and Evesham, when Peter de Montfort had the custody of the castle and park of Northampton, Robert, count de Ferrières, and his servants, by force and against the will and without the knowledge of the same Peter, broke the wall of the park towards Moulton and entered it with dogs and greyhounds and took four deer and carried them away without licence; therefore let the matter be dealt with before the king, because he is a baron.

It is presented etc. that William the son of Warin, when Warin of Bassingbourn had the custody of the aforesaid park and warren, took in the same warren four hares without warrant. And he did not come, and he was not attached; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause him to come at Huntingdon on the morrow [4] of St. Hilary. Of the aforesaid William ten pounds.

Presentatum est etc. quod Reginaldus[1] de Grey cum aliis de familia et societate sua intrauit parcum predictum tempore quo idem habuit custodiam eiusdem parci et fugauit in eodem pro voluntate sua et cepit quinque feras ad minus, cuniculos eciam et lepores tam in parco quam in warenna, vnde certus numerus non potuit inquiri. De eo

coram rege coram rege quia baro.

Presentatum etc. quod Hugo filius et manupastus Hugonis Gobyun consuetus est intrare warennam predictam cum leporariis suis tempore Willelmi[2] Dachet et cepit per vices tres lepores ad minus et asportauit sine warento. Et non venit nec fuit attachiatus; ideo preceptum est balliuis burgi Norhamt' quod distringant predictum Hugonem per omnia catalla sua in balliua sua inuenta ita quod habeat recto predictum Hugonem filium suum coram iusticiariis apud Huntingdon' in crastino[3] sancti Hillarii.

VI (a).[4]

PLACITA FORESTE IN COMITATU SUMERS' IN CRASTINO[5] SANCTE KATERINE ANNO QUADRAGESIMO SECUNDO CORAM WILLELMO BRITON' ET SOCIIS SUIS IUSTICIARIIS ITINERANTIBUS AD PLACITA FORESTE IN EODEM COMITATU.

[6]Placita de warenna de Sumerton'.

Presentatum [est] per Philippum le Cheualer (ij s) et Robertum Seynt Cler (dimidia marca), viridarios, quod die[7] Lune proxima post Natiuitatem beate Marie anno tricesimo sexto Hunfridus homo Ricardi de Ortiaco occidit vnum damum in dicta warenna et asportauit. Dictus Hunfridus mortuus est et essoniatus de morte; ideo nichil de eo. Et quia villate de Sumerton' (xx s), Kingesdon' (alibi), Petteneye (dimidia marca) et Cnolle (iij s) non venerunt plenarie etc.; ideo in

misericordie misericordia.

Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum quod die[8] Martis proxima post festum sancti Andree apostoli anno quadragesimo Ricardus le

[1] The appointment of Reynold de Grey is not enrolled on the Patent Rolls.

[2] William Dachet was appointed warden of the park and warren of Northampton by letters patent dated 28 August 1271. See Patent Roll 88, memb. 5.

[3] 14 January 127$\frac{2}{3}$.

[4] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 152.

[5] Monday, 26 November 1257.

[6] Roll 5, in dorso.

[7] 9 September 1252.

[8] 7 December 1255.

It is presented etc. that Reynold de Grey with others of his household and company entered the aforesaid park when he had the custody of the same park and hunted in it at will, and took five deer at least, also rabbits and hares as well in the park as in the warren, of which the precise number could not be ascertained. Concerning him, before the king, because he is a baron.

It is presented etc. that Hugh the son and mainpast of Hugh Gobyon was wont to enter the aforesaid warren with his greyhounds in the time of William Dachet; and he took at different times three hares at least and carried them away without warrant. And he did not come nor was he attached; therefore an order is given to the bailiffs of Northampton that they distrain the aforesaid Hugh by all his chattels found in their bailiwick, so that he may have the aforesaid Hugh his son to right before the justices at Huntingdon on the morrow[3] of St. Hilary.

VI (a).

PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE COUNTY OF SOMERSET ON THE MORROW[5] OF ST. KATHARINE IN THE FORTY-SECOND YEAR BEFORE WILLIAM LE BRETON AND HIS FELLOW JUSTICES IN EYRE FOR PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE SAME COUNTY.

Pleas of the warren of Somerton.

It is presented by Philip the Knight and Robert Sinclair the verderers that on the Monday[7] next after the Nativity of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-sixth year Humphrey, the man of Richard de Lorty, killed a buck in the said warren and carried it away. The said Humphrey is dead, and is essoined of death; therefore nothing of him. And because the townships of Somerton, Kingsdon, Pitney and Knole did not come fully etc., therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that on the Tuesday[8] next after the feast of St. Andrew the apostle in the fortieth year

Rus, clericus de curia domini regis, et socii sui, quorum nomina ignorantur, ceperunt quatuor lepores in eadem warenna. Et modo non venerunt, quia non fuerunt atachiati; ideo ponitur in respectum, quia est de curia domini regis. Et quia villate de Sumerton' (alibi), Petteneye (alibi), Cnolle (alibi) et Kingesdon' (alibi) non venerunt misericordie. plenarie etc.; ideo in misericordia.

Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum quod die[1] Lune infra Natale domini anno quadragesimo primo quidam lepus inuentus fuit mortuus. Inquisicio inde facta fuit per villatas de Sumerton' (alibi), Kingesdon' (alibi), Petteneye (alibi) et Werne (dimidia marca) que dicunt quod dictus lepus mortuus fuit morina et nichil aliud intelligunt nisi inf[ortu]nium. Et quia dicte villate non venerunt plenarie misericordie. etc.; ideo in misericordia.

VI (b).[2]

PLACITA FORESTE APUD IUELCESTR' IN COMITATU SUMERSET' IN CRASTINO[3] ASCENCIONIS DOMINI ANNO REGNI REGIS HENRICI QUINQUAGESIMO QUARTO CORAM DOMINIS HENRICO DE BURGHULLE, MATHEO DE COLUMBAR', NICHOLAO DE RUMES' ET REGINALDO DE AKLE IUSTICIARIIS AD EADEM PLACITA AUDIENDA ET TERMINANDA ASSIGNATIS.

[4] Placita venacionis warrenne de Sumertun'.

Presentatum est per forestarios et per Philippum le Knigt de Sumertun' et Radulfum Huse, viridarios eiusdem warrenne, et conuictum quod Henricus filius Elie, Iohannes le Walays et quidam nomine Ruges et quidam alii, qui fuerunt de societate predicti Henrici, quorum nomina ignorantur, sunt consueti malefactores de leporibus in predicta warrenna. Et non venerunt nec fuerunt attachiati; ideo preceptum. preceptum est vicecomiti[5] quod faciat venire predictum Henricum qui habet terras in comitatu Dors'. Et alii non sunt inuenti, ideo exigantur. exigantur etc.

Presentatum est etc. quod Iohannes de Draykote cepit in predicta

[1] 25 December 1256.

[2] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt,* No. 153.

[3] Friday, 23 May 1270.

[4] Roll 8, in dorso.

[5] The counties of Somerset and Dorset had a sheriff in common, and it was therefore unnecessary to send a mandate to the sheriff of the latter county. See p. 14, note 7.

Richard le Rus, a clerk of the court of the lord king, and his fellows, whose names are not known, took four hares in the same warren. And now they did not come, because they were not attached; therefore the matter is respited because he is of the court of the lord king. And because the townships of Somerton, Pitney, Knole and Kingsdon did not come fully etc., therefore they are in mercy.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that on Monday[1] in Christmas week in the forty-first year, a certain hare was found dead. An inquisition was made thereof by the four townships of Somerton, Kingsdon, Pitney and Wearne, who say that the said hare died of murrain, and that they know of nothing else except misadventure. And because the said townships did not come fully etc., therefore they are in mercy.

VI (b).

PLEAS OF THE FOREST AT ILCHESTER IN THE COUNTY OF SOMERSET ON THE MORROW[3] OF ASCENSION DAY IN THE FIFTY-FOURTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY BEFORE SIRS HENRY OF BURGHILL, MATHEW DE COLOMBIÈRES, NICHOLAS OF ROMSEY AND REYNOLD OF OAKLEY, JUSTICES ASSIGNED FOR HEARING AND DETERMINING THE SAME PLEAS.

. . . .

Pleas of the venison of the warren of Somerton.

It is presented by the foresters and by Philip the Knight of Somerton and Ralph Hussey, the verderers of the same warren, and proved that Henry the son of Elias, John the Welshman, and a certain person Ruges by name, and certain others who consorted with the aforesaid Henry, whose names are not known, are habitual evil doers to the hares in the aforesaid warren. And they did not come, nor were they attached; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid Henry, who has lands in the county of Dorset, to come. And the others are not found; therefore let them be exacted.

It is presented etc. that John of Draycott took in the aforesaid

warrenna die[1] Iouis proxima ante festum Purificacionis beate Marie anno quinquagesimo tercio vnum leporem; et asportauit sine waranto. preceptum. Et non venit nec fuit attachiatus; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eum venire in crastino[2] sancte Trinitatis. Postea venit pre- prisona. dictus Iohannes et detentus est in prisona. Et eductus finiuit per v marce. quinque marcas; plegii Willelmus de Bonham et Willelmus de Godemanneston'.

Presentatum est etc. quod Robertus filius Pagani et plures alii de familia sua, quorum nomina ignorantur, ceperunt in predicta warrenna vigilia[3] sancti Bartolomei anno quinquagesimo tercio vnum leporem et asportauerunt sine waranto. Idem Robertus non venit preceptum. nec fuit attachiatus; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eum venire crastino[2] sancte Trinitatis.

Presentatum est etc. quod Iohannes Triz de Iuelcestr', Willelmus Petit de eadem, Walterus Stek de eadem, sunt consueti malefactores de venacione domini regis in predicta warenna. Et non venerunt preceptum. nec fuerunt attachiati; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire predictos Iohannem et Willelmum in crastino[2] sancte Trinitatis. exigatur. Et predictus Walterus non est inuentus; ideo exigatur etc. Postea prisona. venit predictus Willelmus le Petit et detentus est in prisona. Et predictus Iohannes Triz venit similiter; et detentus est in prisona.

VII.[4]

PLACITA DE VENACIONE IN COMITATU ROTELAND' AUDITA APUD OKHAM IN CRASTINO[5] NATIUITATIS SANCTI IOHANNIS BAPTISTE CORAM ROGERO DE CLIFFORD MATHEO DE COLUMBAR' NICHOLAO DE ROMES' ET REGINALDO DE AKLE IUSTICIARIIS[6] ITINERANTIBUS AD PLACITA FORESTE IN EODEM COMITATU ANNO REGNI REGIS HENRICI FILII REGIS IOHANNIS QUINQUAGESIMO TERCIO.

Presentatum est et conuictum per Petrum de Neuill', capitalem forestarium foreste comitatus Roteland', et per Henricum Mordak' et

[1] 31 January 126$\frac{8}{9}$.
[2] Monday, 9 June 1270.
[3] Friday, 23 August 1269.
[4] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 140.
[5] Monday, 25 June 1269.
[6] The letters patent appointing these persons itinerant justices are dated 9 June 1269, and are enrolled on Patent Roll 86, m. 12.

warren on the Thursday[1] next before the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the fifty-third year a hare; and he carried it away without warrant. And he did not come, and he was not attached, therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause him to come on the morrow[2] of the Holy Trinity. Afterwards the aforesaid John comes and is detained in prison. And being brought out, he made fine by five marks; his pledges were William of Bonham and William of Godmanstone.

It is presented etc. that Robert the son of Payn and many others of his household, whose names are not known, took in the aforesaid warren on the vigil[3] of St. Bartholomew in the fifty-third year a hare; and they carried it away without warrant. The same Robert did not come, nor was he attached; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause him to come on the morrow[2] of the Holy Trinity.

It is presented etc. that John Trice of Ilchester and William Petty of the same town and Walter Stek are habitual evil doers to the venison of the lord king in the aforesaid warren. And they did not come, nor were they attached; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid John and William to come on the morrow[2] of the Holy Trinity. And the aforesaid Walter is not found, therefore let him be exacted. Afterwards the aforesaid William Petty comes, and is detained in prison. And the aforesaid John Trice comes likewise; and is detained in prison.

VII.

PLEAS OF THE VENISON IN THE COUNTY OF RUTLAND HEARD AT OAKHAM ON THE MORROW[5] OF THE NATIVITY OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST BEFORE ROGER OF CLIFFORD, MATTHEW DE COLOMBIÈRES, NICHOLAS OF ROMSEY AND REYNOLD OF OAKLEY, JUSTICES ITINERATING FOR PLEAS OF THE FOREST IN THE SAME COUNTY IN THE FIFTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY THE SON OF KING JOHN.

It is presented and proved by Peter de Neville, chief forester of the forest of the county of Rutland, and by Henry Murdoch and Peter of

Petrum de Wppingham, viridarios eiusdem foreste, quod quedam dama inuenta fuit in bosco Hugonis de Wppingham bersata et mortua die [1] sancti Iacobi anno regni regis predicti quadragesimo quam Stephanus de Wppingham tunc wodeuardus eiusdem bosci primo inuenit et ostendit Roberto Prutfot, tunc forestario domini regis, qui pro suspicione eiusdem dame bersate traditus fuit per pleuinam Ricardo filio Iordani de Wppingham et Michaeli filio Michaelis de eadem habendum eum coram iusticiariis proximo itineraturis ad placita foreste in comitatu predicto; et non uenit, ideo predicti plegii sui in misericordia. Inquisicio inde facta fuit per forestarios viridarios et quatuor villatas scilicet Wppingham, Estok,' Wardele et Aston', qui dicunt per sacramentum suum quod melius putant dictam damam fuisse bersatam in libertate [2] quam in foresta, nec aliquid aliud inde postea potuit inquiri. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod uenire faciat predictum Stephanum coram iusticiariis de die in diem. Et quia predicte villate non uenerunt plenarie ad inquisicionem faciendam, ideo in misericordia.

misericordia.

preceptum.

. . . .

[3] Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum et per regardatores et duodecim milites et alios liberos et legales homines quod cum dominus rex dedisset Iacobo de Paunton' duas [4] damas in foresta predicta idem Iacobus cepit sex damas vnde quatuor erant sine warento; et per tumultum quem fecit taborando in stabilia sua exierunt plures fere de foresta in libertatem [2] que ibi capte erant ad dampnum domini regis et detrimentum foreste sue. Et predictus Iacobus venit; et super hoc conuictus detentus est in prisona.

prisona.

. . . .

[5] De prisis Petri de Neuill'.

Presentatum est et conuictum per viridarios regardatores et duodecim tam milites quam alios liberos et legales homines quod parcus domini regis de Ridelington' et alii dominici bosci sui deteriorati sunt post ultima placita foreste per Petrum de Neuill' et per forestarios et balliuos et venditores suos per dona sua et per capciones maeremii ad domos ipsius Petri et per uendiciones eorum et per capciones suas ad rogos calcis factos in foresta ad opus eiusdem Petri et ad plura astra

[1] 25 July 1256.
[2] See p. 15, note 4.
[3] Roll 2.
[4] On the 30 July 1263 the king directed the warden of Rutland forest to cause James of Panton to have one buck. See Close Roll 84, m. 5.
[5] Roll 3.

Uppingham, the verderers of the same forest that a certain doe was found shot and dead in the wood of Hugh of Uppingham on the day[1] of St. James in the fortieth year of the reign of the king aforesaid; and Stephen of Uppingham, then the woodward of the same wood, was the first to find it; and he showed it to Robert Prutfoot, then a forester of the lord king. And Stephen, being suspected about the doe which was shot, was delivered on pledge to Richard the son of Jordan of Uppingham and Michael the son of Michael of the same town to have him before the justices next in eyre for pleas of the forest in the county aforesaid. And he has not come; therefore his aforesaid pledges are in mercy. An inquisition was made thereof by the foresters, verderers, and four townships, to wit Uppingham, Eaststoke, Wardley and Ayston, who say upon their oath that they think that the said doe was shot in the liberty rather than in the forest, and nothing else could afterwards be ascertained thereof. And the sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid Stephen to come before the justices from day to day. And because the aforesaid townships did not come fully to make inquisition, therefore they are in mercy.

. . . .

It is presented by the same persons and proved, and also by the regarders and twelve knights and other free and loyal men that when the lord king gave James of Panton two does in the forest aforesaid, the same James took six does, whereof four were without warrant. And by reason of the noise which he made by beating drums when he beset the does many beasts came out of the forest into the liberty and were taken; to the loss of the lord king and the detriment of his forest. And the aforesaid James comes, and being convicted of this is detained in prison.

. . . .

Of the extortions of Peter de Neville.

It is presented and proved by the verderers, regarders and twelve as well knights as other free and loyal men that the lord king's park of Ridlington and other his demesne woods have been impaired since the last pleas of the forest by Peter de Neville and by his foresters, bailiffs and salesmen by their gifts and by their takings of timber for the houses of the same Peter, and by their sales and their takings for limekilns made in the forest for the use of the same Peter, and for

sustinenda ad carbonem faciendam que facta fuerunt in balliua pre-
dicti Petri ad opus ipsius Petri de septem milibus quercuum et roborum
et aliarum arborum et amplius—precium cuiuslibet quercus roboris [1]
ccc li. et arboris duodecim denarii. Summa tres centum et quinquaginta
libre—. Deteriacio eciam facta de subbosco et exbrancatura in pre-
dicto parco et predictis boscis per predictum Petrum et forestarios et
balliuos et uenditores suos predictos per predictum tempus nullo modo
poterit estimari sicut per predictos est protestatum.

Scrutatis et inspectis rotulis de itinere [2] Galfridi de Langel' et sociorum suorum iusticiariorum itinerancium ad placita foreste apud Okham anno regni domini regis qui modo est tricesimo tercio, compertum est quod presentatum erat et conuictum coram eisdem iusticiariis in itinere suo per viginti et quatuor iuratores milites et legales homines de comitatu Roteland' quod cum rex Henricus primus filius regis Willelmi bastardi iturus fuisset uersus partes aquilonares transiuit per quendam boscum, qui uocatur Riseberwe, qui boscus est in comitatu Leycest'; et ibi uidit quinque bissas; qui statim precepit cuidam seruienti suo nomine Pichardus quod in partibus illis moraretur usque ad reditum suum a partibus predictis et dictas bissas interim ad opus suum custodiret. Contigit autem quod infra annum illum dictus rex ibi non rediit; infra quem annum dictus Pichardus associauit se cuidam seruienti eiusdem patrie, qui uocabatur Hascullus de Athelakeston', ad cuius domum sepius conuersabatur. Finito uero anno illo postquam predictus rex rediit a partibus aquilonaribus, adiit dictus Pichardus regem predictum dicens [3] se nolle amplius balliuam predictam custodire. Et tunc requisitus ab ipso rege quis esset idoneus ad dictam balliuam custodiendam respondit dicens quod dictus Hascullus qui terras ibidem habuit vicinas et manens erat in eadem balliua. Et tunc dictus rex commisit Hascullo predicto dictam balliuam custodiendam videlicet forestariam de comitatu Leycest' et similiter Roteland', qui eam custodiuit toto tempore suo, et qui per longum tempus uixit, scilicet usque ad tempus regis Stephani, et qui tunc occisus fuit in domo sua per Bartholomeum de Verdon'. Post cuius Hasculli decessum quidam Petrus filius suus recepit balliuam predictam a rege Henrico auo domini regis qui nunc est custodiendam; qui eciam Petrus duxit neptem Iuonis de Neuill' in vxorem; qui quidem Iuo erat filius Alani de Neuill'. Et cum idem Iuo uideret quod ingressus dicti Hasculli in predictam balliuam non erat certus

[1] For the meaning of this word see the Glossary at the end of this book.

[2] The rolls of the eyre of Geoffrey of Langley are not at the Public Record Office.

[3] This word is repeated in the MS.

supporting several hearths for making charcoal, which [sales and gifts] were made in the bailiwick of the aforesaid Peter for the use of the same Peter to the amount of seven thousand oaks and fuel trees and other trees and more; the price of each oak, fuel tree and tree being twelve pence. Total, three hundred and fifty pounds. But the injury done to the underwood and branchwood in the aforesaid park and in the aforesaid woods by the aforesaid Peter and his foresters, bailiffs and salesmen aforesaid during the aforesaid time cannot in any way be estimated, as is witnessed by the aforesaid persons.

Upon a search among and an inspection of the rolls of the eyre of Geoffrey of Langley and his fellow justices in eyre for pleas of the forest at Oakham in the thirty-third year of the lord king who now is, it is found that it was presented and proved before the same justices in their eyre by twenty-four sworn knights and loyal men of the county of Rutland that when king Henry the First, the son of king William the Bastard, was on his way towards northern parts, he passed through a certain wood, which is called Riseborough, in the county of Leicester. And there he saw five hinds. And he forthwith ordered a certain servant of his by name Pichard, to tarry in those parts until his return from the parts aforesaid, and in the meantime to guard the said hinds for his use. But it happened that in that year the said king did not return there; and in it the said Pichard associated himself to a certain serjeant of the same country who was called Hasculf of Allexton, whose house he frequented much. But when the year was passed, after the aforesaid king had returned from the northern parts, the said Pichard came to the king aforesaid, saying that he was unwilling to be custodian of the aforesaid bailiwick any longer. And on being then asked by the same king, who would be a fit person to be custodian of the said bailiwick, he replied, the said Hasculf, who had lands near there, and was resident in the same bailiwick. And then the said king entrusted to the aforesaid Hasculf the custody of the said bailiwick, to wit the forestry of the county of Leicester and also of Rutland; and he was custodian of it all his time, and he lived for a long time, that is to say till the time of king Stephen, and was then killed in his own house by Bartholomew de Verdun. And after the death of this Hasculf, a certain Peter, his son, received the custody of the aforesaid bailiwick from king Henry, the grandfather of the lord king who now is. And this Peter married the niece of Ives de Neville, who was the son of Alan de Neville. And when the same Ives saw that the entry of the said Hasculf into the bailiwick aforesaid was neither certain nor stable, he by

neque stabilis, per se ipsum et amicos suos fecit tantum erga dominum regem predictum quod idem rex dimisit eidem Petro predictam custodiam foreste de comitatu Leyc' et Roteland' pro habendo mortuum boscum et siccum de bruellis regis in comitatu Roteland' reddendo per annum regi ad scaccarium suum quadraginta solidos. Idem Petrus qui per longum tempus uixit, scilicet usque ad tempus regis Iohannis, totam balliuam, ut prenominatum est, per predictum redditum tenuit. Mortuo eodem Petro, Hascullus [1] filius eius eandem balliuam a dicto rege Iohanne recepit pro predicto redditu reddendo, qui eam integram custodiuit, donec dominus Henricus rex qui nunc est totam forestam de comitatu Leyc' pro uoluntate sua deafforestauit [2] scilicet anno regni sui decimo nono. Custodiam uero foreste de comitatu Roteland' dictus Hascullus toto tempore uite sue custodiuit vsque ad annum coronacionis domini regis Henrici qui nunc est tricesimo tercio; quo quidem anno idem Hascullus reddidit se religioni. Et idem dominus rex tunc dictam balliuam, scilicet custodiam foreste de comitatu Roteland', Petro [3] de Neuill' filio predicti Hasculli conmisit, qui eam modo custodit. Set quod idem Petrus aut aliquis predecessorum suorum aliquam cartam feofamenti de predicta balliua unquam habuisset nessciunt predicti iuratores. Et duodecim tam milites quam probi et legales homines de comitatu Leic' iurati et requisiti de omnibus particulis predictis et de tenura predecessorum dicti Hasculli de Neuill' et eciam ipsius Hasculli et de ingressu eorundem in forestariam predictam dixerunt et concordarunt se in omnibus cum predictis viginti et quatuor iuratis de comitatu Roteland' sicut predictum est; vnde preceptum fuit per predictos iusticiarios viridariis, scilicet Henrico Murdak' et Petro de Wppingham, qui adhuc sunt viridarii, et Willelmo de Castre qui fuit viridarius a tempore itineris predicti usque ad iter Willelmi Britonis et sociorum suorum ultimo itinerancium ante nunc ad placita foreste in comitatu Roteland', quod extunc responderent domino regi de omnibus proficuis prouenientibus de foresta Roteland' saluis tamen forestario de feodo chiminagio debito, expeditacione canum locis debitis et mortuo et sicco bosco, qui potest colligi sola manu sine

[1] Hasculf (also called Haco) of Allexton was appointed by letters patent, dated 29 June 1220. See Pat. Roll 21, m. 4.

[2] On 20 February 123$\frac{4}{5}$ the king disafforested all that part of the county of Leicester which, in accordance with the provisions of the Great Charter of the Forest, ought to have been disafforested (Charter Roll 29, m. 15). He did not expressly disafforest the whole county; and indeed it is evident from the perambulation of the forest printed on p. 53 that a small portion of the county of Leicester remained forest.

[3] On 8 January 124$\frac{8}{9}$ the king granted the custody of the forest of Rutland to William of Northampton during pleasure (Patent Roll 58, m. 8), and on 1 May 1249 he granted seisin of the bailiwick of the same forest to Peter de Neville (Close Roll 63, m. 10).

the exertions of himself and his friends so moved the aforesaid lord king that the same king committed to the same Peter the aforesaid custody of the forest of the county of Leicester and Rutland, to have the dead and dry wood of the king's groves in the county of Rutland, rendering annually to the king at his exchequer forty shillings. The same Peter, who lived for a long time, that is to say until the time of king John, held the whole bailiwick as is before named by the aforesaid rent. On the death of the same Peter, Hasculf his son received the same bailiwick from the said king John for the aforesaid rent, and he had the custody of the whole of it until the lord Henry, the king who now is, of his own will disafforested the whole forest of the county of Leicester, that is to say in the nineteenth year of his reign. But the custody of the forest of the county of Rutland the said Hasculf kept all his life until the thirty-third year of the coronation of the lord king Henry who now is; in which year the same Hasculf entered religion. And the same lord king then entrusted the said bailiwick, that is to say the custody of the forest of the county of Rutland, to Peter de Neville, the son of the aforesaid Hasculf, who now has it. But the aforesaid jurors do not know that the same Peter or any of his predecessors ever had any charter of feoffment of the aforesaid bailiwick. And twelve knights and good and loyal men of the county of Leicester, being sworn and questioned concerning all the aforesaid particulars and of the tenure of the predecessors of the said Hasculf de Neville and also of the same Hasculf and their entry into the aforesaid forestry, said and agreed in all things with the aforesaid jurors of the county of Rutland as is aforesaid. Wherefore it was ordered by the aforesaid justices to the verderers, to wit Henry Murdoch and Peter of Uppingham, who are still verderers, and William of Castor, who was a verderer from the time of the eyre aforesaid until the eyre of William le Breton and his fellows who were last in eyre before now for pleas of the forest in the county of Rutland, that they should thenceforth answer to the lord king for all profits coming from the forest of Rutland, saving nevertheless to the forester in fee due chiminage, lawing of dogs in places where it is due, and dead and dry wood which can be

utensili ferreo in dominicis boscis domini regis in eodem comitatu. Et dicunt viridarii et regardatores et alii milites et probi homines iurati quod prefatus Petrus de Neuill', custos foreste supradicte in comitatu Roteland', appropriauit sibi iniuste et percepit a tempore itineris Willelmi Briton' et sociorum suorum iusticiariorum itinerancium ad placita foreste in comitatu predicto, scilicet ab anno quadragesimo vsque nunc, hoc est per tresdecim annos, omnia subscripta que ad dominum regem pertinent, videlicet nuces in dominicis boscis regis
vj marce et dimidia. que ualuerunt per idem tempus sex marcas et dimidiam ; et retropannagium et proficuum glandis in eisdem boscis que ualuerunt undecim
xj marce et dimidia. marcas et dimidiam ; et cableiceum quod ualuit viginti et quatuor
xxiiij libre. libras ; et escapium in parco de Ridelinton' vnde recepit dimidiam
dimidia marca. marcam tempore predicto.

Idem Petrus appropriauit sibi placita de spinis, corulis et de huiusmodi minuto viridi ; et ipsa placitauit in swanimotis suis que ad dominum regem pertinent et non ad firmam suam, vnde percepit per
xiij marce. predictum tempus tresdecim marcas.

Idem Petrus appropriauit sibi iniuste placita de capcione leporum wlpium cuniculorum et catorum et de canibus et leporariis habitis in foresta contra assisam, que placita pertinent ad dominum regem et non ad firmam ipsius Petri; unde idem Petrus recepit de Roberto de
v marce. Pilton pro leporariis suis habitis in foresta contra assisam quinque
xx sol. marcas, de Radulfo de Kyrkeby pro eodem viginti solidos, de
x sol. Willelmo Basset de Luffenham pro eodem decem solidos, de Radulfo
ij marce. de sancto Licio pro eodem duas marcas, de priore de Weston' pro
ij marce. eodem duas marcas, de Egidio archidiacono Norhampton' pro eodem
c sol. centum solidos. Et quia predictus Petrus omnes denarios predictos iniuste percepit et placita predicta et proficua sibi appropriauit que ad dominum regem pertinent et non ad firmam suam ad exheredacionem ipsius domini regis ; ideo de predictis denariis respondeat ; et ad
ad iudicium. iudicium de eo pro transgressione.

Presentatum est eciam et conuictum per predictos iuratores quod cum dictus rex dedisset fratri suo domino regi Alleman' in bosco suo de Stokewod', in quo vicini parcium illarum solent et debent de iure habere communam herbagii, de spinis et subbosco ad includendum villam suam de Okham tempore turbacionis nuper habite in regno, per quod idem boscus positus fuit in defensum per triennium per preceptum domini

collected with the hand alone without any iron instrument in the demesne woods of the lord king in the same county.

And the said verderers and regarders and other knights and good men being sworn say that the aforesaid Peter de Neville, warden of the forest aforesaid in the county of Rutland, from the time of the eyre of William le Breton and his fellow justices in eyre for pleas of the forest in the county aforesaid, to wit from the fortieth year till now, that is for thirteen years, appropriated unlawfully and took all the underwritten things which belong to the lord king, that is to say, nuts in the demesne woods of the king, which were worth for the same period six and a half marks, and afterpannage and profit of mast in the same woods, which were worth eleven marks and a half, and windfalls, which were worth twenty-four pounds, and escapes in the park of Ridlington, whereof he received half a mark in the period aforesaid.

The same Peter appropriated to himself pleas of thorns, hazels and such like small vert and pleaded them in his swanimotes, which pleas belong to the lord king and not to the farm of the same Peter, and he took therefor during the aforesaid period thirteen marks.

The same Peter appropriated to himself unlawfully pleas of taking hares, foxes, rabbits and cats, and of having dogs and greyhounds in the forest against the assize, which pleas belong to the lord king and not to the farm of the same Peter; whereof the same Peter received from Robert of Pilton five marks for having his greyhounds in the forest against the assize; and of Ralph of Kirkby twenty shillings for the same offence, and of William Basset of Luffenham ten shillings for the same offence, of Ralph de Senlis two marks for the same offence, of the prior of Weston two marks for the same offence, of Giles, archdeacon of Northampton, a hundred shillings for the same offence. And because the aforesaid Peter took all the aforesaid moneys unjustly and appropriated to himself the aforesaid pleas and profits which belong to the lord king and not to his farm, to the disinheritance of the same lord king, therefore let him answer for the aforesaid moneys, and to judgment with him for the trespass.

It is presented also and proved by the aforesaid jurors that whereas the said king had given in his wood of Stokewood, in which the neighbouring people of those parts are wont and of right ought to have common of herbage, to his brother the lord king of Germany thorns and underwood for inclosing his town of Oakham in the time of turbulence which prevailed recently in the realm, and for this reason the same wood was placed in defence for three years by the

regis, vt predictus Petrus dicebat, ne animalia eundem boscum intrarent ita quod subboscus eiusdem possit recrescere, idem Petrus tenuit eundem boscum in defensum iam per quinquennium et cepit de aueriis intrantibus boscum illum per escapium termino predicto, uidelicet, aliquando pro uno auerio duos solidos, aliquando decem et octo denarios, aliquando duodecim denarios et aliquando sex denarios. Et est summa
xxx sol. capcionis illius triginta solidi. Et quia idem Petrus denarios illos qui ad firmam suam non pertinent iniuste cepit, ideo de ipsis denariis
ad iudicium. respondeat; et ad iudicium de eo pro iniusta capcione.

[1] Adhuc de prisis Petri de Neuill'.

Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum quod cum dominus rex precepisset quod placea illa in qua facta fuit uendicio in parco de Ridelinton' includeretur ut posset recresscere Petrus de Neuill' fecit agistare quam plurima animalia in placea illa postquam inclusa fuit que corroserunt sciones cipporum quercuum uenditarum et subbosci prostrati et magnam partem eorum cipporum fecit eradicare et carbonare ita quod nunquam recrescet ad dampnum domini regis et
c libre. heredum suorum de centum libris vnde idem Petrus respondeat; et
ad iudicium. ad iudicium de eo de predicta transgressione.

Idem Petrus percepit de herbagio in placea illa de agistamento
xxxv libre. predicto triginta et quinque libras que ad dominum regem pertinent et non ad firmam ipsius Petri vnde idem Petrus respondeat; et ad
ad iudicium. iudicium de eo de iniusta capcione.

Idem Petrus fecit includere quandam placeam in eodem parco que uocatur la Dale et percepit tam de feno uendito in eadem placea
xvj libre. quam de escapio aueriorum et herbagio sexdecim libras.

Idem Petrus appropriauit sibi quandam particulam terre in Stok' que capta fuit in manum domini regis in ultimo itinere iusticiariorum itinerancium ad placita foreste in comitatu predicto et vocatur
iiij marce. Esschelund' et percepit inde comodum quatuor marcarum ante nunc, de quibus ipse respondeat; et terra capiatur in manum domini regis;
ad iudicium et remaneat; et ad iudicium de predicto Petro pro iniusta appropriacione.

Idem Petrus appropriauit sibi duodecim denarratas annui redditus de Iohanne de Vffinton' pro vna acra terre de dominico domini regis in Depedal' per totum tempus quo fuit forestarius ad exhere-

[1] Roll 3, in dorso.

precept of the lord king, as the aforesaid Peter said, so as to prevent animals entering the same wood so that the underwood of the same might grow again, the same Peter has now kept the same wood in defence for a space of five years, and has taken for beasts entering that wood by way of escape in the period aforesaid for each beast sometimes two shillings, sometimes eighteen pence, sometimes one shilling and sometimes sixpence. And the total of the money so taken is thirty shillings. And because the same Peter unlawfully took those pence which did not belong to his farm, therefore let him answer for the same pence, and to judgment with him for his unlawful taking.

As yet of the extortions of Peter de Neville.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that whereas the lord king had ordered that that place in which the sale was made in the park of Ridlington should be enclosed so that it could grow again, Peter de Neville agisted very many animals in that place after it was enclosed, which ate the shoots of the stumps of the oaks which had been sold and of the underwood which had been felled; and he caused a great part of those stumps to be uprooted and made into charcoal, so that it can never grow again, to the loss of the lord king and his heirs of one hundred pounds; for which let the same Peter answer, and to judgment with him for the aforesaid trespass.

The same Peter took for herbage in that place for the agistment aforesaid thirty-five pounds which belong to the lord king and not to the farm of the same Peter; for which let the same Peter answer, and to judgment with him for the unlawful taking.

The same Peter caused to be enclosed a certain place in the same park which is called la Dale, and he took as well for hay sold in the same place as for the escape of beasts and for herbage sixteen pounds.

The same Peter appropriated to himself a certain parcel of land in Stoke which was taken into the hand of the lord king in the last eyre of the justices itinerating for pleas of the forest in the county aforesaid and is called Esschelund; and he has taken, as the profit thereof, four marks up till now, for which let him answer, and let the land be taken into the hand of the lord king; and let it remain there; and to judgment with the aforesaid Peter for his unlawful appropriation.

The same Peter appropriated to himself the annual rent of twelve pence of John of Uffington for one acre of land of the king's demesne in Depedale during his whole time as forester, to the disinheritance of

dacionem domini regis; vnde idem Petrus respondeat de viginti
ad iudicium. solidis per viginti annos; et ad iudicium de eo pro iniusta appropriacione.

Idem Petrus inposuit magistro Willelmo de Martiuallis quod erat malefactor de venacione domini regis in balliua sua, et inprisonauit eum apud Athelakeston' per duas vices, et postmodum deliberauit
c solidi. ipsum per finem centum solidorum quos recepit ab eo, de quibus respondeat domino regi; et ad iudicium de eo quia deliberauit pre-
ad iudicium. dictum magistrum Willelmum sine warento.

Idem Petrus inposuit Allesie sorori predicti magistri Willelmi quod ipsa receptauit bona et catalla ipsius fratris et cepit ab ea occasione illa viginti quarteria frumenti cumulata, precio quarterii
iiij libre. quatuor solidis. Summa quatuor libre.

Idem Petrus cepit ab eadem Alesia eadem occasione duas vaccas
xx solidi. precii viginti solidorum, vnde idem Petrus respondeat domino regi; et protestatum fuit per viridarios regardatores et alios iuratores, quod predictus magister Willelmus non est culpabilis de aliqua transgres-
ad iudicium. sione foreste; ideo ipse quietus; et ad iudicium de predicto Petro pro iniustis prisis predictis et pro iniusto inprisonamento predicto.

Idem Petrus inposuit Henrico Gerard' quandam transgressionem
dimidia marca. foreste; et cepit aueria sua et detinuit quousque soluisset ei dimidiam
v solidi. marcam pro deliberacione ipsorum, et quinque solidos pro warda eorundem; vnde idem Petrus respondeat domino regi; et ad iudicium de eo pro iniusta capcione eo quod protestatum est per viridarios regardatores et omnes alios iuratores quod nulla emenda transgressionum foreste pertinent ad ipsum, set ad dominum regem.

Idem Petrus cepit de Alexandro filio Galfridi de Lydington' pro
dimidia marca. uno lepore quem cepit in bruellis de Seyton' dimidiam marcam que capcio ad ipsum non pertinebat set ad dominum regem pertinebat;
ad iudicium. et ideo respondeat inde domino regi; et ad iudicium de eo pro iniusta capcione.

Idem Petrus inprisonauit Robertum le Hayward' de Lydington' apud Athelakeston' pro vno cuniculo quem cepit in Estwode
v solidi. extra Wppingham; et deliberauit eum pro quinque solidis quos cepit ab eo, de quibus respondeat domino regi, eo quod emenda capcionis cuniculorum in foresta pertinent ad dominum regem et
ad iudicium. non ad ipsum Petrum; et ad iudicium de eo de iniusta capcione predictorum denariorum et de predicto inprisonamento et deliberacione.

the lord king; wherefore let the same Peter answer for twenty shillings for twenty years, and to judgment with him for his unlawful appropriation.

The same Peter imputed to Master William de Martinvast that he was an evil doer with respect to the venison of the lord king in his bailiwick; and he imprisoned him at Allexton on two occasions, and afterwards he delivered him for a fine of one hundred shillings which he received from him; for which let him answer to the lord king, and to judgment with him because he delivered the aforesaid Master William without any warrant.

The same Peter imputed to Alice the sister of the aforesaid Master William that she received the goods and chattels of her brother, and took from her on that account twenty heaped quarters of wheat, the price of each quarter four shillings; the total, four pounds.

The same Peter took from the same Alice on the same occasion two cows, of the price of twenty shillings; wherefore let the same Peter answer to the lord king. And it was witnessed by the verderers, regarders and other jurors that the aforesaid Master William is innocent of any trespass in the forest; therefore he is quit; and to judgment with the aforesaid Peter for the unlawful extortions and for the unlawful imprisonment aforesaid.

The same Peter charged Henry Gerard with a certain trespass to the forest; and took his beasts and detained them until he had paid to him half a mark for their delivery and five shillings for their custody; wherefore let the same Peter answer to the lord king; and to judgment with him for his unlawful taking, on the ground that it is witnessed by the verderers, regarders and all the other jurors that no emends of trespasses to the forest belong to him, but to the lord king.

The same Peter took half a mark from Alexander the son of Geoffrey of Liddington for one hare which he took in the grove of Seaton, which taking did not belong to him, but to the lord king; and therefore let him answer for it to the lord king, and to judgment with him for his unlawful taking.

The same Peter imprisoned Robert the hayward of Liddington at Allexton for a rabbit, which he took in Eastwood, outside Uppingham, and he delivered him for five shillings which he took from him, and of which let him answer to the lord king on the ground that emends of the taking of rabbits in the forest belong to the lord king and not to the same Peter; and to judgment with him for his unlawful taking of the aforesaid moneys, and for his imprisonment and delivery aforesaid.

Idem Petrus inprisonauit Petrum filium Constantini de Lydington' per duos dies et duas noctes apud Athelakeston' [vinctum][1] cathenis ferreis pro suspicione capcionis cuiusdem cuniculi in Estwod'; et idem Petrus filius Constantini dedit hominibus predicti Petri de Neuill', qui custodiebant illum duos[2] denarios, pro eo quod permittebant ipsum sedere super quandam formam in gayola ipsius Petri que plena est aqua in fundo. Et[3]

Idem Petrus inprisonauit Robertum de Pilton' apud Athelakeston' in cathenis ferreis pro transgressione foreste quam imposuit; [et] deliberauit ipsum sine waranto; et cepit ab eo viginti et duos denarios pro custodia duorum equorum ipsius Roberti, quos detinuit dum
ij sol. iiij d. [tenuit ipsum] in prisona et quatuor denarios ad exitum porte sue.
ad iudicium. Idem Petrus respondeat de denariis; et ad iudicium de eo etc.

Idem Petrus cepit de Roberto de Neuill' et Radulfo, fratre suo, triginta marcas pro transgressione foreste quam imposuit eis; [cuius transgressionis] emenda ad dominum regem pertinebant[4] et non ad ipsum Petrum; ideo respondeat de denariis; et ad iudicium de eo etc.

Idem Petrus cepit predictum Robertum de Neuill' in domo matris sue et inprisonauit; et postea dimisit eum sine warento pro vno [equo,
iiij marce. precii] quatuor marcarum de quibus respondeat; et ad iudicium de eo.

Idem Petrus cepit de Ricardo de Albomonasterio, qui mortuus est, pro capcione vnius dami in foresta sine waranto viginti et quatuor
ad iudicium. marcas [vnde respondeat et ad] iudicium de eo etc.

Idem Petrus cepit de Henrico Murdak' pro receptamento Henrici filii sui malefactoris de venacione in foresta viginti marcas, de quibus respondeat domino regi; et ad iudicium de eo.

Idem Petrus cepit de predicto Henrico pro mastinis suis qui semel sequebantur carucarios suos usque in pratum de Depedale quod est infra forestam centum solidos, de quibus respondeat; et ad iudicium etc.

Idem Petrus cepit de eodem Henrico quinque marcas pro escapio bouum suorum in pratum domini regis de la Dale vnde respondeat etc.

Idem Petrus fecit summonere sepius plures uillatas quod uenirent coram eo ad inquisiciones de foresta faciendas; [et quia villate] non uenerunt amerciauit ad uoluntatem suam et leuauit amerciamenta illa

[1] The correct reading of this word is very doubtful.
[2] This and the following word are interlineated in the roll.
[3] This entry ends abruptly in the roll as here printed. There is no marginal note opposite to it in the roll, but the sum of twopence taken by Peter is included in the sum of money in the margin opposite the next entry.
[4] MS. 'pertinebat.'

The same Peter imprisoned Peter the son of Constantine of Liddington for two days and two nights at Allexton, and bound him with iron chains on suspicion of having taken a certain rabbit in Eastwood; and the same Peter the son of Constantine gave two pence to the men of the aforesaid Peter de Neville, who had charge of him, to permit him to sit upon a certain bench in the gaol of the same Peter, which is full of water at the bottom. And . . .

The same Peter imprisoned Robert of Pilton at Allexton in iron chains for a trespass to the forest, with which he charged him; and he delivered him without warrant, and took from him twenty-two pence for the custody of two horses belonging to the same Robert, which he detained while he kept him in prison, and fourpence on his going out from his gate. Let the same Peter answer for the moneys, and to judgment with him etc.

The same Peter took from Robert de Neville and Ralph his brother thirty marks for a trespass to the forest, with which he charged them, of which trespass emends belong to the lord king and not to the same Peter; therefore let him answer for the pence, and to judgment with him etc.

The same Peter took the aforesaid Robert de Neville in the house of his mother, and imprisoned him, and aferwards released him without warrant, for a horse, of the price of four marks; for which let him answer, and to judgment with him.

The same Peter took twenty-four marks from Richard of Whitchurch, who is dead, for taking a buck in the forest without warrant; for which let him answer, and to judgment with him etc.

The same Peter took twenty marks from Henry Murdoch for harbouring Henry his son, an evil doer with respect to the venison in the forest; for which let him answer to the lord king, and to judgment with him.

The same Peter took one hundred shillings from the aforesaid Henry for his mastiffs, which once followed his ploughmen as far as the meadow of Depedale, which is within the forest; for which let him answer, and to judgment etc.

The same Peter took five marks from the same Henry for the escape of his oxen into the lord king's meadow of la Dale; whereof let him answer etc.

The same Peter often caused many townships to be summoned before him to make inquisitions concerning the forest; and because the townships did not come, he amerced them at his will, and levied those amercements, which belong to the lord king and not to the same

que ad dominum regem pertinent et non ad ipsum Petrum, vnde recepit sexaginta solidos, de quibus respondeat. Et ad iudicium etc.

Idem Petrus [inposuit] priori de Land' quod quedam fere exierunt forestam et intrauerunt parcum ipsius prioris qui est [iungens][1] foreste per quod ipse Petrus fecit [cariare] plures carectas foragii ad comburendam hayam parci illius; et postmodum dictus prior fecit finem cum eo de pace habenda pro triginta marcis. Et quia emenda huiusmodi transgressionis ad dominum regem pertinent, et non ad dictum Petrum ideo de denariis respondeat et ad iudicium etc. (ad iudicium.)

[2] Adhuc de prisis Petri de Neuill'.

Idem Petrus cepit de Willelmo le Ryder, forestario sub ipso, pro transgressione venacionis in foresta viginti solidos, vnde respondeat etc.; et ad iudicium de eo etc. (xx sol. iudicium.)

Idem Petrus habuit singulis annis preterquam inter bella de Lewes et de Evesham [3] porcheriam suam et porcos suos aliquando trescentos fodientes in haya domini regis sine waranto ad magnam deterioracionem pasture ferarum domini regis; vnde ad iudicium de eo. Et sciendum est quod proficuum glandis et pasture predicte computatur prius ut patet. (ad iudicium.)

Idem Petrus habuit quendam forestarium, quem de nouo videlicet per tres annos iam elapsos assignauit ad custodiendum chiminum inter Stanford' et Briggechasterton' quod est in forinseca diuisa foreste ex parte orientali et ad capiendum chiminagium ad opus suum in partibus illis; et uocatur ille forestarius Thomas de Saldeford qui cepit de qualibet carecta ducente buscam uel maeremium de comitatu Linc' usque Stanfordiam per chiminum predictum quatuor denarios pro chiminagio contra assisam foreste et contra cartam domini regis de libertate foreste vnde summa non potest inquiri. Et testificatum est per omnes iuratores quod nec dictus Petrus nec antecessores sui unquam habuerunt aliquem forestarium ibidem custodientem ibidem chiminum nec capientem chiminagium ibidem ante tres annos predictos nec de iure habere debuerunt, ideo ad iudicium de eo. (ad iudicium.)

Idem Thomas arrestauit carectam Galfridi filii Sarre de Empingham carcatam fraxinis in chimino inter Stanford' et Empingham et exegit de eodem Galfrido chiminagium. Et quia idem Galfridus dixit

[1] Here again the correct reading is very doubtful.

[2] Roll 4.

[3] For the dates of these battles see p. 40, note 2 above.

Peter; and he received thereof sixty shillings; for which let him answer, and to judgment etc.

The same Peter charged the prior of Launde with the fact that certain deer came out of the forest and entered the park of the same prior, which adjoins the forest; on account of which the same Peter caused several cartloads of forage to be taken to burn the enclosure of that park. And afterwards the said prior made fine with him for thirty marks to have peace. And because emends of trespass of this kind belong to the lord king and not to the said Peter, therefore let him answer for the money, and to judgment etc.

As yet of the extortions of Peter de Neville.

The same Peter took twenty shillings from William le Rider, the forester under him, for a trespass to the venison in the forest; for which let him answer etc., and to judgment with him etc.

The same Peter in every year, except in the year between the battles of Lewes and Evesham, had his piggery and his pigs, sometimes to the number of three hundred, digging in the enclosure of the lord king without warrant, to the great injury of the pasture of the deer of the lord king; wherefore to judgment with him. And it must be known that the profit of the mast and of the aforesaid pasture is reckoned as before appears.

The same Peter had a certain forester whom he appointed recently, that is to say for the three years last past, to guard the road between Stamford and Bridge Casterton, which is in the outlying part of the forest on the eastern side, and to take chiminage for his own use in those parts. And that forester is called Thomas of Salford; and he took from every cart carrying wood or timber from the county of Lincoln along the aforesaid road to Stamford four pence for chiminage against the assise of the forest and against the charter of the lord king concerning the liberty of the forest, of which moneys the sum cannot be ascertained. And it is witnessed by all the jurors that neither the said Peter nor his ancestors ever had any forester there guarding the road there nor taking chiminage there before the aforesaid three years, nor by law ought they to have had one; therefore to judgment with him.

The same Thomas arrested the cart of Geoffrey the son of Sara of Empingham, which was laden with ash trees, in the road between Stamford and Empingham, and demanded chiminage from the same Geoffrey. And because the same Geoffrey said that he was not law-

quod non debuit de iure dare ei aliquod chiminagium eo quod fraxini quas ducebat amputate erant in curia sua propria in villa de Empingham que est extra metas foreste, idem Thomas maliciose leuauit vthesium super ipsum Galfridum et distrinxit ipsum quo usque dedisset ei duos solidos et inuenisset plegios veniendi ad swanimotum et cum idem Galfridus venisset ad swanimotum predictus Petrus cepit eum et inprisonauit apud Athelakeston' et postea dimisit eum per finem dimidie marce quam soluit ei. Et quia conuictum est quod hoc totum factum est iniuste et contra assisam foreste; ideo ad iudicium de predicto Petro. Et idem Petrus respondeat de denariis. Et quia conuictum est quod predictus Thomas forestarius multa dampna et graues extorsciones fecit hominibus de partibus predictis contra assisam foreste et contra tenorem carte de libertatibus foreste, ideo idem Thomas committitur prisone et finiuit alibi. Et preceptum est quod de cetero non sit aliquis forestarius in partibus predictis nec[1] quod aliquod chiminagium capiatur ibidem contra tenorem carte predicte.

dimidia marca.

Conuictum est eciam quod quinque forestarii pedites videlicet duo in balliua de Beaumund et duo in balliua de Braunceston' et vnus in parco de Ridelington' et vnus forestarius eques cum vno garcione sufficiunt ad totam forestam Roteland' custodiendam et quod plures forestarii non debent esse in eadem nec antiquitus esse consueuerunt; ideo preceptum est quod decetero non sint ibi plures forestarii quam predicti quinque pedites et vnus eques ut predictum est.

Et quia prefatus Petrus multos habuit forestarios sub ipso in dicta foresta qui habebant garciones sub eis ad dampnum et superoneracionem tocius patrie; ideo ad iudicium de eo. Et preceptum est quod nullus forestarius pedes de cetero habeat sub se garciones in foresta.

Idem Petrus fecit quandam gaiolam apud Athelakeston' in comitatu Leyc' que est plena aqua in fundo et in quam plures homines imprisonauit quos cepit iuste et iniuste occasione balliue sue in comitatu Roteland' et multos ex eis deliberauit pro uoluntate sua et sine waranto; ideo ad iudicium de eo etc.

ad iudicium.

Et quia similiter testificatum est quod omnes prisones capti in comitatu Roteland' tam occasione foreste quam omni alia occasione debent inprisonari in castro de Okham et quod vicecomes Roteland'

[1] This word is omitted in the MS.

fully bound to give to him any chiminage, on the ground that the ash trees which he was carrying were cut down in his own court in the town of Empingham, which is outside the metes of the forest, the same Thomas maliciously raised the hue upon the same Geoffrey and distrained him till he gave him two shillings, and found pledges to come to the swanimote. And when the same Geoffrey came to the swanimote the aforesaid Peter took him and imprisoned him at Allexton and afterwards released him for a fine of half a mark, which he paid to him. And because it is proved that all this was done unlawfully and against the assise of the forest, therefore to judgment with the aforesaid Peter, and let the same Peter answer for the money. And because it is proved that the aforesaid Thomas the forester subjected the men of the parts aforesaid to much loss and grievous extortions against the assise of the forest and against the tenor of the charter concerning the liberties of the forest, therefore the same Thomas is committed to prison, and he made fine elsewhere. And it is ordered that in future there be no forester in the parts aforesaid, and that chiminage be not taken there against the tenor of the charter aforesaid.

It is proved also that five walking foresters, to wit two in the bailiwick of Beaumont, and two in the bailiwick of Braunston, and one in the park of Ridlington, and one riding forester, together with one page, are sufficient to guard the whole forest of Rutland, and that more foresters ought not to be, nor of old were wont to be, in the same forest. Therefore it is ordered that in future there be not more foresters than the aforesaid five walking foresters and one riding forester as is aforesaid.

And because the aforesaid Peter had many foresters under him in the said forest, who had pages under them, to the damage and overburdening of the whole country, therefore to judgment with him. And it is ordered that no walking forester in future is to have pages under him in the forest.

The same Peter made a certain gaol at Allexton in the county of Leicester, which is full of water at the bottom, and in which he imprisoned many men whom he took lawfully and unlawfully by reason of his bailiwick in the county of Rutland; and he delivered many of them at his pleasure and without warrant. Therefore to judgment with him.

And because in like manner it is witnessed that all prisoners, as well on account of the forest as on every other account, taken in the county of Rutland ought to be imprisoned in the castle of Oakham,

debet de eis respondere et prefatus Petrus multos prisones captos occasione foreste in comitatu Roteland' inprisonauit in prisona sua apud Athelakeston' in comitatu Leyc' ut predictum est; ideo loquendum de eo coram rege.

loquendum coram rege.

Idem Petrus posuit Iohannem de Neuill', personam de Erburg', per pleuinam ad ueniendum ad swanimotum suum ad attachiandum se pro transgressione venacionis in foresta predicta ei imposita. Et quia idem Iohannes non venit ad swanimotum illum idem Petrus amerciauit plegios suos et cepit ab eis viginti marcas. Et quia nulla amerciamenta de transgressione venacionis ad predictum Petrum pertinent[1] prout superius patet; ideo respondeat de denariis predictis. Et ad iudicium de eo etc.

sex marcc.

[2] Perambulacio foreste Roteland' incipit ab illo loco vbi uetus[3] cursus Lytele incidit in Weland' contra Cotene;[4] et ab inde per cursum aque de Weland' usque ad diuisam inter comitatus Lincoln' et Roteland' per metas et bundas usque Stumpedestone; et ab inde per metas et bundas usque ad pontem Magne Casterton'; et a ponte illo per cursum aque de Wass usque ad pontem Empingham; et a ponte illo per cursum aque vsque Stanbrigghe,[5] et de Stanbrigge per medium parcum de Bernardeshul usque Twiford';[5] et de Twiford per cursum aque per mediam uiam[6] de Langham; et ab inde usque parcum de Ouertun'; et ab inde inter Flitris et boscum de Cnossinton' usque in aquam de Wass; et ab inde per diuisas inter campum de Branceston' et Cnossinton' usque Wisp; et ab inde per diuisas inter campum de Osolueston' et Wythkoc usque ad ianuam castri de Sawueye et ab inde per riuulum descendentem de Sawueye usque ad molendinum[7] Harewyni; et ab inde usque ad Copptre;[7] et de Coptre usque diuisas de Fincheford;[7] et ab inde per ueterem cursum de Lytele usque in Weland' contra Cotene.[8]

[1] MS. 'pertinet.' [2] Roll 4 in dorso.

[3] The word 'uetus' is used because Peter de Nevill diverted the course of the river. See *Rotuli Hundredorum*, vol. ii. p. 50.

[4] This is not Kettone, which lies on the river Chaten, but Cotton, in the parish of Gretton and county of Northampton. See p. 35, above.

[5] There is no trace of either Stanbridge or Twiford on the Ordnance Map.

[6] The word 'uiam' is probably a clerical error for 'uillam.'

[7] Harewyns Mill and Coptre are not marked on the Ordnance Map, but Finchford is probably there represented by Finchley bridge.

[8] A later perambulation of this forest is printed on p. 116.

and that the sheriff of Rutland ought to answer for them; and that the aforesaid Peter imprisoned in his own prison at Allexton in the county of Leicester many prisoners who were taken on account of the forest as is aforesaid; therefore let it be discussed concerning him before the king.

The same Peter put John de Neville, the parson of Harbury, on pledge to come to his swanimote to be attached for a trespass charged to him to the venison in the forest aforesaid. And because the said John did not come to that swanimote the same Peter amerced his pledges, and took from them twenty marks. And because no amercements for trespass to the venison belong to the aforesaid Peter, as appears above, therefore let him answer for the money aforesaid, and to judgment with him etc.

The perambulation of the forest of Rutland begins from that place where the old course of the Little Eye flows into the Welland opposite Cotton; and from thence along the course of the water of the Welland up to the boundary between the counties of Lincoln and Rutland; by metes and bounds as far as Stumpsden; and from thence by metes and bounds as far as Great Casterton bridge; and from that bridge along the course of the water of the Gwash as far as Empingham bridge; and from that bridge along the course of the water as far as Stanbridge; and from Stanbridge through the middle of the park of Barnsdale as far as Twiford; and from Twiford along the course of the water through the middle of the town of Langham; and from thence as far as the park of Overton, and from thence between Flitteris and the wood of Knossington as far as the water of the Gwash, and from thence along the boundaries between the open field of Braunston and Knossington as far as the Wisp; and from thence along the boundaries between the field of Owston and Withcote as far as the door of the castle of Sauvey, and from thence by the rivulet which runs down from Sauvey as far as Harewin's mill; and from thence to Coptre, and from Coptre as far as the boundaries of Finchford; and from thence by the old course of the Little Eye into the Welland opposite Cotton.

VIII.[1]

PLACITA FORESTE APUD GULDEFORD IN COMITATU SURR' A DIE[2] SANCTI IOHANNIS BAPTISTE IN QUINDECIM DIES CORAM ROGERO DE CLIFFORD, MATHEO DE COLUMBAR', NICHOLAO DE ROMESIA ET REGINALDO DE ACLE IUSTICIARIIS AD EADEM PLACITA AUDIENDA ASSIGNATIS ANNO REGNI REGIS HENRICI FILII REGIS IOHANNIS QUINQUAGESIMO TERCIO.

. . . .

[3] De venacione in parco domini regis de Guldeford.

Presentatum est et conuictum per viridarios et per viginti et quatuor probos et legales homines tam de villa de Guldeford quam de partibus adiacentibus et per plures villatas iuratas quod Walterus Walerand', Willelmus frater eius, Willelmus Schortfrend, Willelmus Basemund et Iohannes Polswayn qui mortui sunt et Thomas de Bosco fuerunt consueti malefactores de venacione domini regis et de cuniculis in parco de Guldeford; et recettati aliquando ad domum Radulfi de Slifeld' et aliquando ad domum Alani de Slifeld et aliquando ad domum Iohannis Attehoke qui fuerunt concensientes malefactis suis. Et hii omnes predicti ceperunt in parco predicto in festo[4] Pentecostes anno quinquagesimo primo vnum damum et vnam damam et tresdecim cuniculos sine warento; et Robertus de Forde similiter est eorum recettator et concensiens malefactis suis. Predicti Radulfus, Alanus et Iohannes de la Hok' venerunt et super hoc conuicti detenti sunt in prisona. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire predictos Thomam et Robertum die[5] Martis in crastino Translacionis sancti Swthuni. Postea venit predictus Thomas et super hoc conuictus detentus est in prisona. Postea predictus Thomas de Bosco eductus de prisona finem fecit per unam marcam per pleuinam Willelmi de Chakedon' et Willelmi le Ryde de Stokes. Et predictus Radulfus de Slifeld' eductus de prisona finem fecit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Rogeri de Sutton' et Willelmi de Chakedon'. Et predictus Alanus eductus a prisona finem fecit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Petri de Murechelegh' et Willelmi le

prisona; prisona; prisona.

prisona.

j marca.

dimidia marca.

dimidia marca.

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 194.
[2] 8 July 1270.
[3] Roll 3 in dorso.
[4] 5 June 1267.
[5] 16 July 1269.

VIII.

PLEAS OF THE FOREST AT GUILDFORD IN THE COUNTY OF SURREY IN THE QUINDENE[2] OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST BEFORE ROGER DE CLIFFORD, MATHEW DE COLOMBIÈRES, NICHOLAS OF ROMSEY AND REYNOLD OF OAKLEY JUSTICES ASSIGNED FOR HEARING THE SAME PLEAS IN THE FIFTY-THIRD YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING HENRY THE SON OF KING JOHN.

. . . .

Of the venison in the lord king's park of Guildford.

It is presented and proved by the verderers and by twenty-four good and loyal men as well of the town of Guildford as of the parts adjacent to it, and by many sworn townships that Walter Walerand, William his brother, William Shortfriend, William Basemund and John Polswayn who are dead, and Thomas de Bois were habitual evil doers to the venison of the lord king and to his coneys in Guildford park; and sometimes they were harboured at the house of Ralph of Slyfield, and sometimes at the house of Alan of Slyfield, and sometimes at the house of John atte Hook, who were privy to their offences. And all those persons aforesaid took in the park aforesaid on Whitsunday[4] in the fifty-first year one buck and one doe and thirteen coneys without warrant. And Robert of Ford in like manner is their harbourer, and is privy to their offences. The aforesaid Ralph, Alan and John atte Hook came, and being convicted of this are imprisoned. And the sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid Thomas and Robert to come on Tuesday[5] the morrow of the Translation of St. Swithin. Afterwards the aforesaid Thomas came; and being convicted of this is detained in prison. Afterwards the aforesaid Thomas de Bois, being brought out of prison, made fine by one mark by the pledge of William of Chakedon and William le Ryde of Stoke. And the aforesaid Ralph of Slyfield, being brought out of prison, made fine by half a mark by the pledge of Roger of Sutton and William of Chakedon. And the aforesaid Alan being brought out of prison made fine by half a mark by the pledge of Peter of Mursley and William le Ryde of Stoke. And

Ryde de Stokes. Et predictus Iohannes eductus de prisona finiuit per dimidiam marcam [per pleuinam][1] Andree de Parco et Iohannis le Lormener.

dimidia marca.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Gilebertus de Baseuile, qui mortuus est, Andreas de Fremeleswrth', Radulfus Belegambe, Thomas de Braybof et Robertus Pente, qui mortuus est, ingressi fuerunt parcum predictum in festo[2] beate Marie Magdalene anno quadragesimo septimo cum arcubus et sagittis et leporariis ad malefaciendum de venacione domini regis. Et postquam ingressi erant superuenit Iohannes filius Albredi qui fuit tunc parcarius sub Bartolomeo[3] Parcario; et exclammauit eos; et ipsi tunc euaserunt, ita quod non potuerunt capi. Preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat predictum Andream et Thomam de die in diem etc. Postea protestatum est per eosdem quod Henricus de Godemanneston' et Willelmus de la Tone de Farneborogh' de comitatu Suhamt' fuerunt in societate predicta; et ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat predictum Henricum de Godemanneston' de die in diem. Et mandatum est vicecomiti Suhamt' quod capiat predictum Willelmum atte Tone de Farneberg et in prisona saluo custodiat usque ad proximum aduentum iusticiariorum apud Wynton'. Protestatum est eciam quod predictus Iohannes filius Albredi parcarius mandauerat predictis Gileberto et sociis suis quod venirent die predicto ad predictum malefactum in predicto parco faciendum; set quia ipsi malefactores percepti erant tunc de pluribus hominibus, ipse parcarius exclammauit eos ad cautelam vt velaret malefactum suum proprium. Et dicunt iurati quod idem Iohannes parcarius alias fuit consenciens predictis malefactoribus ad malefaciendum de venacione in parco predicto. Et modo est forestarius in foresta de Wyndels' sub Iordano forestario de feodo; ideo preceptum est constabulario de Windels' quod faciat ipsum venire etc.

preceptum. Wynton'. mandatum. preceptum.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem etc. quod Robertus le King', Petrus le Long', Willelmus Attehegge, qui mortuus est, Radulfus Atteslow, qui similiter mortuus est, et Iohannes filius Henrici Attedone qui fuerunt operarii in parco predicto ad reparandum palicium eiusdem prostrauerunt plures quercus ad palos inde faciendos; et cum venissent fere domini regis ad corrodendum de ramunculis predictarum

[1] These words are omitted in the roll.
[2] 22 July 1263.
[3] Bartholomew was appointed keeper of the king's houses and park at Guildford during pleasure by letters close dated 13 May 1258 (Close Roll 76, memb. 8) in succession to Elias Maunsel. He is described in the letters close as the valet of Edmund the king's son, and elsewhere (*e.g.* in Close Roll 85, memb. 8) he is called Bartholomew of Salisbury.

the aforesaid John being brought out of prison made fine by half a mark by the pledge of Andrew of the Park and John le Lormener.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Gilbert de Baseville, who is dead, Andrew of Fremelesworth, Ralph Beljambe, Thomas de Brayboef, and Robert Pente, who is dead, entered the park aforesaid on the feast[2] of the blessed Mary Magdalene in the forty-seventh year with bows and arrows and greyhounds to do evil to the venison of the lord king. And after they had entered, John the son of Aubrey, who was then the parker, under Bartholomew the parker, came up, and hailed them. And they then escaped so that they could not be taken. The sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid Andrew and Thomas to come day by day etc. Afterwards it is witnessed by the same persons that Henry of Godmanstone, and William atte Town of Farnborough, of the county of Southampton, were in the company aforesaid; therefore the sheriff is ordered that he cause the aforesaid Henry of Godmanstone to come day by day. And an order is sent to the sheriff of Southampton that he take the aforesaid William atte Town of Farnborough and safely keep him in prison until the next coming of the justices to Winchester. It is witnessed also that the aforesaid John the son of Aubrey, the parker, had sent word to the aforesaid Gilbert and his fellows that they should come on the day aforesaid for the aforesaid evil doing in the aforesaid park; but because the aforesaid evil doers were then perceived by many men, the same parker hailed them by way of device, to conceal his own evil deed. And the jurors say that the same John the parker on other occasions consented to the aforesaid evil doers doing evil to the venison in the park aforesaid. And now he is forester in the forest of Windsor under Jordan the forester in fee; therefore the constable of Windsor is ordered to cause him to come etc.

It is presented and proved by the same persons etc. that Robert King, Peter Long, William atte Hedge, who is dead, Ralph atte Slough, who likewise is dead, and John the son of Henry atte Down, who were workmen in the park aforesaid repairing the paling of the same park, felled several oaks for making palings thereof. And when the deer of the lord king came to browse on the little branches of the aforesaid

quercuum tetenderunt laqueos ad ipsas capiendas; et in crastino[1] Omnium Sanctorum anno quadragesimo quarto[2] superuenit Bartholomeus parcarius et inuenit predictos malefactores cum predictis laqueis extensis, et cepit eos, et liberauit eos Willelmo[3] la Zuche tunc vicecomiti Surr' ad inprisonandum; et postmodum per mandatum Thome[4] de Gredlegh', tunc iusticiarii foreste, liberati erant per ballium vsque ad proxima placita foreste. Predicti Willelmus et Radulfus mortui, essoniati primo die de morte; ideo plegii sui quieti. Et predicti Robertus, Petrus et Iohannes venerunt et super hoc conuicti detenti

prisona.

sunt in prisona. Postea predictus Iohannes Attedone, eductus a prisona, finem fecit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Iohannis de Garkem . . et Willelmi filii Clementis de Wereplesdon'. Postea venit Robertus le King [et] eductus a prisona finiuit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Roberti de Parco et Willelmi de Apecrofte. Et predictus Petrus eductus a prisona finiuit per dimidiam marcam per pleuinam Ricardi de Aldeburn' et Andree Atteho[k]e.

dimidia marca.

dimidia marca.

dimidia marca.

alibi.

alibi.

Presentatum est etc. quod Philippus de Hertmere (alibi), Willelmus nepos eius (alibi) et Galfridus le Gyw ceperunt in parco predicto in crastino[5] sancti Andree anno quadragesimo septimo vnum damum sine warento. Preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eos venire etc. Postea venerunt predicti Philippus et Willelmus et, super hoc conuicti, detenti sunt in prisona. Et predicti Philippus et Willelmus fecerunt finem alibi.[6] Et predictus Galfridus non venit nec fuit attachiatus; ideo exigatur; et nisi venerit vtlagetur.

exigatur.

Presentatum est etc. quod Alanus filius Alani Basset, qui mortuus est, Angodus Baret, Alanus le Forestar', Willelmus le Skot et alii quorum nomina ignorantur, intrauerunt parcum predictum cum arcubus et sagittis in crastino[7] sancti Yllarii anno quadragesimo octauo ad malefaciendum de venacione domini regis. Et superuenit Bartholomeus parcarius; et perceptus de eis exclammauit eos et ipsi statim fugerunt ita quod non potuerint capi et dimiserunt ibi quinque de canibus suis quos predictus Bartholomeus cepit et adduxit domino regi tunc existente apud Westm'. Predictus Alanus Forestar' est in prisona ut patet superius; et predictus Angodus et Willelmus non venerunt nec fuerunt attachiati quia non fuerunt inuenti, ideo

alibi.

[1] 2 November 1259.

[2] The reading of the MS. is 'quatuor,' which is probably an error for 'septimo,' in which case the date would be 2 November 1262.

[3] William la Zuche was not sheriff of Surrey till 9 July 1261 (see *List of Sheriffs*).

[4] Thomas of Greasley was appointed justice of the forest south of Trent by letters patent dated 11 September 1259 (see Patent Roll 70, memb. 2).

[5] 1 December 1262.

[6] They were convicted of another trespass, for which they made fine by twenty shillings.

[7] 14 January $126\frac{3}{4}$.

oaks, they stretched snares for taking them. And on the morrow[1] of All Saints in the forty-fourth year Bartholomew the parker came up and found the aforesaid evil doers with the aforesaid snares stretched; and he took them and delivered them to William la Zouche who was then sheriff of Surrey for imprisonment. And afterwards by the order of Thomas of Greasley, then the justice of the forest, they were delivered on bail until the next pleas of the forest. The aforesaid William and Ralph, who are dead, were essoined the first day of death; therefore their pledges are quit. And the aforesaid Robert, Peter and John came, and being convicted of this are detained in prison. Afterwards the aforesaid John atte Down being brought out of prison made fine by half a mark by the pledge of John of Garkem.. and William the son of Clement of Worplesdon. Afterwards came Robert le King and, being brought out of prison, made fine by half a mark by the pledge of Robert of the park and William of Apecroft. And the aforesaid Peter, being brought out of prison, made fine by half a mark by the pledge of Richard of Aldbourne and Andrew atte Hook.

It is presented etc. that Philip of Hurtmore, William his nephew, and Geoffrey le Gyw on the morrow[5] of St. Andrew in the forty-seventh year took a buck without warrant in the park aforesaid. The sheriff is ordered to cause them to come etc. Afterwards the aforesaid Philip and William came, and being convicted of this they are detained in prison. And the aforesaid Philip and William made fine elsewhere. And the aforesaid Geoffrey did not come nor was he attached; therefore let him be exacted, and if he do not come, let him be outlawed.

It is presented etc. that Alan the son of Alan Basset, who is dead, Angod Baret, Alan the forester, William le Scot and others, whose names are not known, entered the park aforesaid with bows and arrows on the morrow[7] of St. Hilary in the forty-eighth year to do evil to the venison of the lord king. And Bartholomew the parker came up, and when he was perceived by them he hailed them; and they forthwith fled, so that they could not be taken. And they abandoned there five of their dogs, which the aforesaid Bartholomew took, and brought to the lord king, who was then at Westminster. The aforesaid Alan the forester is in prison, as appears above, and the aforesaid Angod and William did not come, nor were they attached, because they were not found; therefore let them be exacted, and if

exigantur. exigantur et nisi venerint vtlagentur. Predictus Alanus finem fecit alibi.[1]

[2] Adhuc de venacione in parco.

Presentatum est etc. quod Iohannes Byning', qui mortuus est, fuit malefactor de venacione domini regis in parco predicto et receptatus [fuit] ad domum Iohannis de Aldeham qui malefactis suis fuit consenciens. Et idem Iohannes venit et, super hoc conuictus, detentus est in prisona. Postea predictus Iohannes de Aldeham viginti marce. eductus de prisona finem fecit per viginti marcas per pleuinam Roberti Hamme, Henrici de Middelton', Iohannis de Stocton', Ade de Tundeslegh', Gilberti de Craustoke et Ricardi le Conestable.

Presentatum est etc. quod Andreas de Fremeleswrth', Iohannes le Muegide, qui mortuus est, Walterus Wodecok' et Henricus de Godmanneston' bersauerunt vnum damum in predicto parco die[3] Iouis proxima ante festum sancte Margarete anno quadragesimo septimo. Et superuenit Ricardus le Ram, parcarius sub Bartholomeo parcario. Et perceptus de eis exclamauit eos; qui continuo fugerunt ita quod non potuerunt capi. Et predictus Ricardus parcarius cepit predictum damum et ipsum asportauit ad domum predicti Bartholomei domini sui, qui illum liberauit Iohanni le Taillor senescallo domini Alani[4] la Zuch tunc iusticiarii foreste. Et preceptum est vicecomiti quod venire faciat predictos Andream, Walterum et Henricum de die in diem. Et protestatum est quod non possunt inueniri nec exigantur. habent terras etc.; ideo exigantur, et nisi venerint, vtlagentur. Postea venit predictus Andreas de Fremesleswrth' et super hoc conuictus detentus est in prisona. Qui eductus a prisona finem fecit per decem x solidi. solidos per pleuinam Iohannis de Stocton', Gileberti de Craustok', Roberti de Rengni et Petri de la Paryc.

Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Walterus de Dorekcestr', qui fuit parcarius sub Bartholomeo Parcario, Stephanus atte Done et Thomas de Braybof ceperunt vnam damam in predicto parco die[5] Mercurii in septimana Pentecostes anno quadragesimo secundo sine warento. Et venacionem illam asportauerunt ad domum Galfridi de Braybof, qui eos receptauit et malefacto predicto consenpreceptum. ciens. Nullus eorum venit nec fuit attachiatus; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eos venire de die in diem. Postea venit pre-

[1] He made fine by half a mark for another trespass.
[2] Roll 4. [3] 20 July 1263.
[4] Alan la Zouche was appointed justice of the forest south of Trent by letters patent dated 12 June 1261 (Patent Roll 74, memb. 10).
[5] 15 May 1258.

they do not come let them be outlawed. The aforesaid Alan made fine elsewhere.

As yet of the venison in the park.

It is presented etc. that John Byning who is dead was an evil doer to the lord king's venison in the park aforesaid; and he was harboured at the house of John of Aldham, who was privy to his offences. And the same John came, and being convicted of this is detained in prison. Afterwards the aforesaid John of Aldham, being brought out of prison, made fine by twenty marks by the pledge of Robert Ham, Henry of Middleton, John of Stockton, Adam of Tundeslegh, Gilbert of Crawstock and Richard the constable.

It is presented etc. that Andrew of Fremelesworth, John le Muegide, who is dead, Walter Woodcock, and Henry of Godmanstone shot a buck in the park aforesaid on the Thursday[3] next before the feast of St. Margaret in the forty-seventh year. And Richard le Ram, the parker under Bartholomew the parker, came up, and being perceived by them, hailed them, and they forthwith fled, so that they could not be taken. And the aforesaid Richard the parker took the aforesaid buck, and carried it to the house of the aforesaid Bartholomew his lord, who delivered it to John the Tailor, the steward of Sir Alan la Zouche, then justice of the forest. And the sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid Andrew, Walter and Henry to come day by day. And it is witnessed that they cannot be found, nor have they lands etc.; therefore let them be exacted, and if they do not come, let them be outlawed. Afterwards the aforesaid Andrew of Fremelesworth came, and being convicted of this, is detained in prison. And being brought out of prison, he made fine by ten shillings by the pledge of John of Stockton, Gilbert of Crawstock, Robert de Regny and Peter de la Paryc.

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Walter of Dorchester, who was parker under Bartholomew the parker, Stephen atte Down and Thomas de Brayboef took a doe without warrant in the aforesaid park on the Wednesday[5] in Whitsun week in the forty-second year, and carried that venison to the house of Geoffrey de Brayboef, who harboured them and was privy to the offence aforesaid. None of them came, nor were they attached. Therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause them to come day by day. Afterwards the aforesaid Geoffrey

dictus Galfridus et, super hoc conuictus, detentus est in prisona. Et iiij marce. predictus Galfridus, eductus de prisona, finem fecit per quatuor marcas per pleuinam Roberti de Regny et Iohannis le Garskeyn tam pro se quam pro predictis Stephano et Thoma qui sunt de familia sua. Postea venit predictus Walterus; et, super hoc conuictus, detentus est non fecit finem adhuc. in prisona; et commissus per ballium Roberto le Parker vsque aduentum iusticiariorum ad pacem suam faciendam.

Presentatum est et conuictum etc. quod Iohannes filius Albrede qui fuit parcarius sub predicto Bartholomeo cepit in parco predicto die[1] Iouis proxima ante festum Translacionis sancti Thome Martiris anno quadragesimo octauo vnum damum sine warento et venacionem illam asportauit ad hospicium suum in Guldeford'. Et predictus Iohannes venit; et, super hoc conuictus, detentus est in prisona. Et prisona. predictus Iohannes, eductus a prisona, finem fecit per dimidiam mar- dimidia marca. cam pro hac transgressione et omnibus aliis transgressionibus quia pauperimus per pleuinam Iohannis de Garston' et Nicholai del Park.

Presentatum est etc. quod Iohannes frater Alani persone ecclesie de Aldebyr', qui mortuus est, et Ranulphus nepos eiusdem Alani ceperunt in parco predicto vnum damum die[2] Martis proxima ante festum sancte Trinitatis anno quadragesimo septimo cum leporrariis eiusdem[3] Alani; et venacionem illam asportauerunt ad domum ipsius Alany apud Aldebyr', qui eos receptauit et malefacto predicto consensit. Et quia protestatum est quod predictus Ranulphus manet in comitatu Suhamt'; ideo mandatum est vicecomiti eiusdem comitatus apud Wynton'. quod faciat eum venire coram iusticiariis foreste apud Wynton' in octabis sancti Michaelis. Et mandatum est episcopo Wynton' quod faciat venire predictum Alanum.

Presentatum est per eosdem et conuictum quod Robertus frater Reginaldi de Nyweddegate est frequens malefactor de venacione in parco predicto. Non venit nec fuit attachiatus, quia non fuit inuentus; exigatur. ideo exigatur; et nisi venerit vtlagetur.

pauper. Presentatum est etc. quod Petrus de Dodelesdon' est frequens malefactor de venacione et de cuniculis in parco predicto. Idem condonatur pro rege. Petrus venit et, super hoc conuictus, detentus est in prisona. Con- prisona. donatur pro rege quia [pauper[4]].

[1] 3 July 1264.
[2] 22 May 1263.
[3] MS. 'eidem.'
[4] This word is omitted in the roll.

came, and, being convicted of this, is detained in prison. And the aforesaid Geoffrey, being brought out of prison, made fine by four marks, as well for himself as for the aforesaid Stephen and Thomas, who are of his household, by the pledge of Robert de Regny and John le Garskeyn. Afterwards came the aforesaid Walter, and being convicted of this, he is detained in prison. And he is committed on bail to Robert the parker until the coming of the justices to make his peace.

It is presented and proved etc. that John the son of Aubrey, who was parker under the aforesaid Bartholomew, took in the park aforesaid on the Thursday[1] next before the feast of the Translation of St. Thomas the Martyr in the forty-eighth year one buck without warrant; and carried that venison to his lodging at Guildford. And the aforesaid John came, and being convicted of this is detained in prison. And the aforesaid John, being brought out of prison, made fine by half a mark for this and all other trespasses because he is very poor, by the pledge of John of Garston and Nicholas del Park.

It is presented etc. that John the brother of Alan, the parson of the church of Albury, who is dead, and Ranulph the nephew of the same Alan took in the park aforesaid one buck with the greyhounds of the same Alan on the Tuesday[2] next before the feast of the Holy Trinity in the forty-seventh year. And they carried that venison to the house of the same Alan at Albury, who harboured them and was privy to their offence. And because it is witnessed that the aforesaid Ranulph dwells in the county of Southampton; therefore an order is sent to the sheriff of the same county to cause him to come before the justices of the forest at Winchester on the octave of St. Michael. And an order is sent to the bishop of Winchester to cause the aforesaid Alan to come.

It is presented by the same persons and proved that Robert the brother of Reynold of Newdigate is an habitual evil doer to the venison in the park aforesaid. He did not come; and he was not attached, because he was not found; therefore let him be exacted, and if he do not come, let him be outlawed.

It is presented etc. that Peter of Dodlesdon is an habitual evil doer to the venison and the coneys in the park aforesaid. The same Peter came and, being convicted of this, is detained in prison. He is pardoned on behalf of the king, because he is poor.

[1] Adhuc de parco.

Herebagium. Anno quadragesimo primo agistatus fuit parcus de Guldeford de decem equis et centum bobus et vaccis a termino de la Hockeday[2] vsque ad festum[3] Natiuitatis beati Iohannis Baptiste, videlicet, per octo septimanas. Et pro quolibet equo boue etc. datus fuit qualibet septimana vnus denarius per tempus supradictum. Et est summa iiij libre. quatuor libre. Et post festum predictum remanserunt in herbagio predicti parci viginti aueria per duas septimanas et captus fuit de ij s. vj d. quolibet per septimanam obolum et quadrans. Summa duo solidi et sex denarii vnde Nicholaus Iacob debet respondere.

agistamentum. Eodem anno agistatus fuit idem parcus de centum et quinquaginta et sex porcis. Et datus fuit nomine pannagii tercius porcus, videlicet quinquaginta et duo porci, qui remanserunt in custodia Elie[4] Mauncel tunc existentis parcarii, sicut idem Elias presens recognouit. Et ciiij s. valuit quilibet porcus duo solidi. Summa centum et quatuor solidi vnde predictus Elias debet respondere.

Anno quadragesimo secundo agistatus fuit predictus parcus de decem equis et sexies viginti aueriis per duas septimanas, et de decem equis et sexaginta aueriis per quatuor septimanas, et de quatuor equis et sexdecim aueriis per quinque septimanas. Et datus fuit pro quolibet equo per septimanam vnus denarius et pro quolibet alio xliiij s. ix d. auerio obolus et quadrans. Summa quadraginta et quatuor solidi et nouem denarii, vnde Nicholaus Iacob debet respondere de quindecim solidis et Walterus[5] le Parker de nouem solidis et Elias Mauncel de viginti solidis et nouem denariis.

Anno quadragesimo tercio agistatus fuit predictus parcus de centum et quinquaginta aueriis et de sex equis per duas septimanas et de quater viginti aueriis et quatuor equis per quinque septimanas et de quadraginta et quinque aueriis per quatuor septimanas. Et datus fuit pro herbagio cuiuslibet equi vnus denarius per septimanam et pro quolibet alio auerio obolum et quadrans per septimanam. lij s. vij d. Summa quinquaginta et duo solidi et septem denarii vnde Bartholomeus Parcarius debet respondere.

Anno quadragesimo quarto nullum fuit agistamentum de herbagio[6] pro tempore gwere. Fuit tamen agistatus de ducentis et quadraginta porcis in pessona. Et datus fuit pro pannagio cuiuslibet porci

[1] Roll 4 in dorso.

[2] 25 April 1257.

[3] Sunday, 24 June 1257.

[4] Elias Maunsel was appointed warden of the park of Guildford by letters close dated 2 October 1250 in succession to Alan, the son of Robert Fairchild (see Close Roll 64, memb. 3).

[5] This is the Walter of Dorchester mentioned on p. 57.

[6] MS. 'hergagio.'

As yet of the park.

In the forty-first year the park of Guildford was agisted with ten horses and one hundred oxen and cows from the term of Hockday [2] until the feast [3] of the Nativity of St. John the Baptist, that is to say for eight weeks. And for each horse, ox, etc., there was given for each week one penny during the period abovesaid. And the total is four pounds. And after the feast aforesaid there remained on the herbage of the aforesaid park twenty beasts of the plough for two weeks; and there were taken for each beast three farthings a week. Total two shillings and sixpence, wherefor Nicholas James is to answer.

In the same year the same park was agisted with one hundred and fifty-six pigs. And there was given in the name of pannage every third pig, that is to say fifty-two pigs, which remained in the custody of Elias Maunsel, who was then parker, as the same Elias being present acknowledged. And each pig was worth two shillings. Total one hundred and four shillings, wherefor the aforesaid Elias is to answer.

In the forty-second year the aforesaid park was agisted with ten horses and six score beasts of the plough for two weeks, and with ten horses and sixty beasts of the plough for four weeks, and with four horses and sixteen beasts of the plough for five weeks. And there was given for each horse one penny a week, and for every other beast of the plough three farthings. Total forty-four shillings and ninepence, whereof Nicholas James is to answer for fifteen shillings, and Walter the parker for nine shillings, and Elias Maunsel for twenty shillings and ninepence.

In the forty-third year the aforesaid park was agisted with one hundred and fifty beasts of the plough and six horses for two weeks, and fourscore beasts of the plough and four horses for five weeks, and forty-five beasts of the plough for four weeks. And there was given for the herbage of each horse one penny a week, and for each other beast three farthings a week. Total fifty-two shillings and sevenpence, wherefor Bartholomew the parker is to answer.

In the forty-fourth year there was no agistment for herbage, because of the war. The park was nevertheless agisted with two hundred and forty pigs for mast. And there was given for the

iiij libre. quatuor denarii. Summa quatuor libre vnde heredes Alani[1] Farchild debent respondere.

Idem parcus non fuit agistatus anno quadragesimo quinto neque anno quadragesimo sexto nec de herbagio nec de pannagio. Et anno quadragesimo septimo non fuit agistatus de herebagio. Fuit tamen agistatus eodem anno de centum porcis in pessona. Datus fuit pro
xxxiiij s. iiij d. pannagio cuiuslibet porci quatuor denarii. Summa triginta et quatuor solidi et quatuor denarii, vnde predictus Nicholaus Iacob debet respondere.

Anno quadragesimo octauo non fuit agistatus predictus parcus de porcis pro defectu pessone. Fuit tamen agistatus de quinquaginta et sex aueriis per vnam mensem, vnde Bartholomeus Parcarius recepit
xiiij s. pro herbagio quatuordecim solidi ; et debet inde respondere.

Anno quadragesimo nono, quinquagesimo, quinquagesimo primo non fuit agistatus nec de porcis nec de aueriis.

Anno quinquagesimo secundo non fuit agistatus de porcis pro defectu pessone. Fuit tamen agistatus de aueriis, vnde Bartholomeus
iiij li. Parcarius recepit quatuor libras de quibus respondeat.

De Elia Mauncel et Waltero Purbik' de coperonibus in predicto
xliiij s. iiij d. parco venditis quadraginta et quatuor solidi et quatuor denarii.

Anno quinquagesimo secundo prostrate fuerunt quinquaginta quercus in predicto parco ad operaciones domorum domini regis apud Guldeford' ; et frater Ranulphus de Combreit' custos operacionum
xvij s. regis vendidit coporones earum pro decem et septem solidis quos idem frater recepit.

De heredibus Alani[2] Longis mortui de precio duarum quercuum per ipsum venditarum in predicto parco tempore quo fuit parcarius
iij s. ix d. in predicto parco tres solidi et nouem denarii.

Walterus le Parker recepit de cablicio in predicto parco anno
iij s. quadragesimo tercio tres solidos vnde idem respondeat.

Ricardus [Exchire] seruiens Bartholomei le Parker recepit de cableicio in predicto parco vnam marcam vnde respondeat.

. . . .

[1] As Alan Fairchild, or Farchild, was succeeded as parker by Elias Maunsel on 2 October 1250 (see note 4, p. 59), it is evident that in 44 Hen. iii. he must have been merely an assistant parker or an agister.

[2] It is possible that Alan Longis is the same person as Alan Farchild mentioned above. He may also be a certain Alan of Guildford who is twice described as parker of the park of Guildford in the Close Roll of 40 Hen. iii. (see Close Roll 74, memb. 1 and memb. 5 d.). In any case, he can only have been an assistant parker.

pannage of each pig fourpence. Total four pounds, wherefor the heirs of Alan Farchild are to answer.

The same park was not agisted in the forty-fifth year nor in the forty-sixth either for herbage or for pannage. And in the forty-seventh year it was not agisted for herbage. It was nevertheless agisted in the same year with one hundred pigs for mast. There was given for the pannage of each pig fourpence. Total thirty-four shillings and fourpence, wherefor the aforesaid Nicholas James is to answer.

In the forty-eighth year the aforesaid park was not agisted with pigs for want of mast. Nevertheless it was agisted with fifty-six beasts of the plough during one month, and Bartholomew the parker received for the herbage thereof fourteen shillings; and he is to answer therefor.

In the forty-ninth, the fiftieth, and the fifty-first year it was not agisted either with pigs or with beasts of the plough.

In the fifty-second year it was not agisted with pigs for want of mast. It was nevertheless agisted with beasts of the plough, and Bartholomew the parker received four pounds therefor, for which let him answer.

Of Elias Maunsel and Walter Purbik for shrouds sold in the aforesaid park, forty-four shillings and fourpence.

In the fifty-second year fifty oaks were felled in the aforesaid park for the house building works of the lord king at Guildford, and Friar Ranulph of Combreiton, the guardian of the king's works, sold their shrouds for seventeen shillings, which the same brother received.

Of the heirs of Alan Longis, deceased, three shillings and nine-pence for the price of two oaks sold by him in the aforesaid park at the time when he was parker in the aforesaid park.

Walter the parker received for windfalls in the aforesaid park in the forty-third year three shillings, wherefor let him answer.

Richard Exchire, the servant of Bartholomew the parker, received for windfalls in the aforesaid park one mark, wherefor let him answer.

. . . .

mete et bunde.

[1] Mete et bunde [2] de foresta in comitatu Surr': per Haume vsque ad pontem de Gildeford' per ripam de Waye; et de ponte de Gildeford' per la Copledecroche [3] vsque ad pontem de Mallresot; per Wodebrok [4] vsque ad pontem de Brodesford' [5]; et sic per regale cheminum vsque ad Herpesford'; et sic per riuulum de Herepesford' vsque ad Certes'; et sic per Tamisiam vsque ad Hammes.

IX. (a).[6]

PLACITA FORESTE DE SCHIREWOD' APUD NOTINGHAM CORAM DOMINIS WILLELMO DE VESCY, THOMA DE NORMANUILL' ET RICARDO DE CREPPINGG' IUSTICIARIIS DOMINI REGIS ITINERANTIBUS AD PLACITA EIUSDEM FORESTE IN CRASTINO [7] SANCTI HILLARII ANNO REGNI REGIS EDWARDI QUINTO DECIMO PER FORESTARIOS ET VIRIDARIOS SUBSCRIPTOS VIDELICET PER :—

viridarios.

Ricardum de Iorz, Willelmum de Colewyk', Iohannem de Anesleye, Henricum de Tyneslawe, Willelmum de Beuercotes et Radulfum Clericum de Mammesfeld', iuratos;

forestarios.

Robertum de Eueringham, forestarium feodi, et sub ipso Ricardum de Coningeston', attornatum suum, Robertum le Tayllur, Hugonem Flambard', Willelmum Piscarium, Willelmum de Dunolm', Adam de Ebor', Robertum de Straleye et Willelmum de Blakeburn', forestarios iuratos eiusdem Roberti, Walterum de Wynkeburn', attornatum iusticiarii foreste et sub ipso Willelmum de Hasting', Willelmum de Schaffeud', Willelmum le Waleys, Rogerum de Lyndeby, Bate de eadem, Hugonem de Mammesfeld' et Henricum filium Ricardi de Clippeston'.

. . . .

[8] Presentatum est et conuictum etc. quod die [9] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Willelmi archiepiscopi Ebor' noctanter anno [10]

[1] Roll 1 in dorso.

[2] These metes and bounds should be compared with those printed on p. 117.

[3] There can be little doubt that the Copledecroche is identical with the modern Hog's Back.

[4] The Woodbrook is perhaps the modern Blackwater.

[5] Probably Brodesford is identical with the Brydeford mentioned as a boundary of the forest in certain letters patent dated 26 December 1327 (Patent Roll 168, m. 3), and there stated to be 'where the three counties meet,' in which case it corresponded to the modern Blackwater Bridge.

[6] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 127.

[7] 14 January 128$\frac{6}{7}$.

[8] Roll 3.

[9] 9 June 1276.

[10] In 4 Ed. i.

Metes and bounds of the forest in the county of Surrey: through Ham as far as Guildford bridge along the bank of the Wey; and from Guildford bridge along the Copledecroche as far as the Mallresot bridge; by the Woodbrook as far as Brodesford bridge; and so by the king's highway to Herpesford; and so by the little river from Herpesford as far as Chertsey; and so by the Thames to Ham.

IX. (a).

PLEAS OF THE FOREST OF SHERWOOD AT NOTTINGHAM BEFORE SIRS WILLIAM DE VESCY, THOMAS DE NORMANVILLE, AND RICHARD OF CREEPING, JUSTICES IN EYRE OF THE LORD KING FOR PLEAS OF THE SAME FOREST, ON THE MORROW [7] OF ST. HILARY IN THE FIFTEENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD BY THE FORESTERS AND VERDERERS NAMED BELOW, TO WIT BY:—

verderers. Richard de Jort, William of Colwick, John of Annesley, Henry of Tinsley, William of Bevercotes and Ralph the clerk of Mansfield, who were sworn;

foresters. Robert of Everingham, forester in fee, and under him Richard of Coningeston, his attorney, Robert the tailor, Hugh Flambard, William the fisher, William of Durham, Adam of York, Robert of Strelley, and William of Blackburn, the sworn foresters of the same Robert; Walter of Winkburn, the attorney of the justice of the forest, and under him William of Hastings, William of Shaffeld, William the Welshman, Roger of Linby, Bate of the same town, Hugh of Mansfield, and Henry the son of Richard of Clipstone.

. . . .

It is presented and proved etc. that on the Wednesday [9] next after the feast of St. William, archbishop of York, in the year aforesaid Robert

predicto venerunt Robertus filius Agnetis Bonde de Edenstowe et Ricardus ad capud ville de eadem per mediam villam de Welhawe cum duobus feonibus bisse. Et predictus Robertus captus fuit cum feone suo per homines vigilantes in villa de Welhawe; et commissus cippis Petro de la Barre de eadem. Et idem Robertus fregit cippos et fugit; ideo predictus Petrus manucaptus fuit ad respondendum. Qui predictus Ricardus venit et, super hoc conuictus, liberatur prisone; (et est alibi; est redemptus[1]). Et testatum est quod Robertus filius

mortuus. Agnetis est mortuus; ideo de eo nichil. Et predictus Petrus manet

preceptum est. in eodem comitatu; ideo preceptum est vicecomiti etc.

. . . .

[2] Presentatum est etc. quod Alanus de Leyrton', clericus foreste de Schirewod', per Adam de Eueringham, et Robillard', garcio eius, ceperunt vnam damam in parco de Clippeston' die[3] Veneris proxima ante Ascenscionem Domini anno regni regis Edwardi septimo cum vno leporario ruffo, que commesta fuit cum[4] porcis, quia tam sero capta fuit, quod non potuit inueniri. Qui predictus Alanus venit coram iusticiariis et super hoc conuictus liberatur prisone. Et predictus Robyllard non venit, nec est inuentus, nec habet,[5] nec scitur,[6] nec

exigatur. aliquis etc.,[7] ideo exigatur. Et predictus Alanus est redemptus ad

dimidia marca. dimidiam marcam. Et inuenit manucaptores vt patet etc.

. . . .

[8] Cum Willelmus de Vescy et socii sui iusticiarii itinerantes ad placita foreste de Schirewod' apud Notyngham in octabis[9] sancti Hillarii anno regni regis Edwardi quintodecimo inuenerunt quod dominus rex dampna multimoda habuerit et sustinuerit ab itinere[10] Roberti de Neuill' vsque presens iter pluribus de causis assise foreste minus bene obseruate :—

1. Inprimis prouisum est per eosdem iusticiarios quod omnes viridarii foreste conueniant de quadraginta diebus in quadraginta dies ad attachiamenta tenenda, sicut continetur in carta de foresta, tam

[1] He was ransomed for twenty pence for another trespass, the presentment of which is enrolled on Roll 1 dorso.

[2] Roll 5 d. [3] 5 May 1279.

[4] This use of 'cum' is peculiar; but another example of it in the same sense occurs on the Nottingham eyre rolls of 1334, thus, 'Et carnes manducate fuerunt cum porcis' (see *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 132, *Roll.* 7).

[5] The words 'per quod attachiari potest' must be supplied here.

[6] The words 'ubi manet' must be supplied here.

[7] It is doubtful what words are intended to be represented by the 'etc.'; but probably they are 'apparet pro eo,' meaning that nobody appears to essoign him of death.

[8] Roll 10 d. [9] 20 January $128\frac{6}{7}$.

[10] Robert de Neville and others were justices in eyre at Nottingham in 47 Hen. iii.

the son of Agnes Bonde of Edwinstowe, and Richard atte Townsend, of the same town, came by night through the middle of the town of Wellow with two fawns of a hind. And the aforesaid Richard was taken with his fawn by men watching in the town of Wellow; and committed to the stocks of Peter de la Barre of the same town. And the same Robert broke the stocks and fled; therefore the aforesaid Peter found mainperners to make answer. And the aforesaid Richard came, and being convicted of this is sent to prison. (And he is ransomed elsewhere.) And it is witnessed that Robert the son of Agnes is dead; therefore nothing of him. And the aforesaid Peter dwells in the same county; therefore the sheriff is ordered etc.

. . . .

It is presented etc. that Alan of Leverton, the clerk of the forest of Sherwood, by Adam of Everingham, and Robillard his page took a doe in the park of Clipston on the Friday[3] next before Ascension Day in the seventh year of the reign of king Edward with a red greyhound. And the doe was eaten by the pigs, because it was taken so late in the evening that it could not be found. And the aforesaid Alan came before the justices, and being convicted of this is sent to prison. And the aforesaid Robillard does not come, nor is he found, nor has he etc.; nor is it known etc., nor is any one etc.; therefore let him be exacted. And the aforesaid Alan is ransomed at half a mark. And he finds pledges as appears etc.

. . . .

Whereas William de Vescy and his fellow justices, itinerating for pleas of the forest of Sherwood at Nottingham on the octave[9] of St. Hilary in the fifteenth year of the reign of king Edward, found that the lord king had incurred and sustained losses of many kinds from the time of the eyre[10] of Robert de Neville till the present eyre, from many instances of the assize of the forest not having been sufficiently observed:

1. First it is provided by the same justices that all verderers of the forest are to assemble every forty days to hold, as is contained in the charter of the forest, attachments both concerning the vert and

de viridi et venacione quam de minutis placitis tenendis et placitandis que debent placitari in attachiamentis, vt de hiis que inferius tanguntur. Et quod omnes viridarii decetero respondeant coram iusticiariis in itinere per vnum rotulum de viridi et venacione; et non quilibet per se habeat rotulos de diuersis balliuis proferendos coram iusticiariis.

2. Item prouisum est quod omnes dominici bosci domini regis et haye et parci sui decetero sic custodiantur de viridi, quod si quis manens infra forestam captus fuerit in eisdem amputans viridem quercum per terram, attachiatur veniendi ad proximum attachiamentum et ibi inueniet sufficientes plegios vsque proximum iter. Et manuopus statim apprecietur per forestarios et viridarios et reddat precium viridariis in pleno attachiamento quando inueniet plegios vsque iter. Et si idem alias inuentus fuerit cum consimili transgressione viridi in dominicis boscis vel haiis fiat de eo vt prius. Et si tercio inueniatur cum huiusmodi transgressione in dominicis boscis vel haiis capiatur et prisone domini regis Notyngh' saluo custodiatur quousque deliberetur per speciale mandatum domini regis vel eius iusticiarii de[1] foresta.

3. Item prouisum est quod si aliquis manens extra forestam inuentus fuerit cum aliqua transgressione viridi infra dominicos boscos domini regis vel hayas statim manuopus apprecietur vt superius et corpus suum committatur prisone quousque deliberetur per mandatum regis vel iusticiarii foreste. Et si secundo inuentus fuerit in eisdem boscis vel haiis fiat de eo vt prius. Et si tercio ammittat equos cum caretta vel boues cum carra, vel precium eorundem; et illud precium in proximo et pleno attachiamento liberetur viridariis vel quatuor villatis propinquioribus ad opus domini regis, vt ipse viridarius vel heredes sui vel villate respondeant domino regi coram iusticiariis in itinere.

4. Item prouisum est pro hiis qui manent infra forestam, quod cum capti fuerint in dominicis boscis domini regis vel haiis amputantes bletrones, branchias vel siccum de quercubus vel querulos vel spinetas vel telam vel alneam vel hussum vel huiusmodi arbores sine waranto attachientur per duos bonos plegios veniendi ad proximum attachiamentum inde responsuri; et ibi amercientur secundum quantitatem transgressionis sue coram senescallo et viridariis; et

[1] This and the following word are repeated in the MS.

venison, and for the holding and pleading small pleas, which ought to be pleaded in attachments, such as those pleas which are touched upon below; and that all verderers in future are to make answer before the justices in eyre by a single roll of the vert and the venison; and that they are not to have, each one for himself, rolls of the different bailiwicks for production before justices.

2. Also it is provided that all the demesne woods of the lord king and his enclosures and parks be in future so guarded as to the vert, that if any one dwelling within the forest be taken in the same felling a green oak to the ground he be attached to come to the next attachment, and there he is to find sufficient pledges till the next eyre. And his mainour is forthwith to be appraised by the foresters and verderers; and he is to pay the price to the verderers in full attachment, when he shall find pledges till the eyre. And if the same man be found a second time trespassing in like manner against the vert in the demesne woods or enclosures, it is to be done with him as before. And if he be found a third time so trespassing in the demesne woods or enclosures, he is to be taken and safely kept in the prison of the lord king at Nottingham, until he be delivered by the special order of the lord king or his justice of the forest.

3. Also it is provided that if any one dwelling outside the forest be found doing any trespass against the vert within the demesne woods of the lord king or in an enclosure, his mainour is to be forthwith appraised as above, and his body is to be committed to prison until he be delivered by the mandate of the king or the justice of the forest. And if he be found a second time in the same woods or enclosures it is to be done with him as before. And if a third time, he is to lose his horses with his cart, or his oxen with his waggon, or their price; and that price is to be paid in the next and full attachment to the verderers or to the four neighbouring townships for the use of the lord king, so that the verderer or his heirs or the townships may answer therefor to the lord king before the justices in eyre.

4. Also it is provided with respect to those who dwell within the forest that when they are taken in the demesne woods of the lord king or in his enclosures cutting saplings, branches or dry wood from oaks or hazels or thorns or a lime or an alder or a holly or such like trees without warrant, they are to be attached by two good pledges to come to the next attachment to make answer therefor; and there they are to be amerced according to the quantity of their trespass before the steward and verderers; and that amercement is to be raised at the next

illud amerciamentum leuetur ad opus domini regis ad proximum attachiamentum nisi sit pro bletrone qui excedit precium quatuor denariorum ; et si excedat tunc attachietur vsque iter vt predictum est.

5. Item prouisum est quod escapia aueriorum in dominicis hayis vel boscis implacitentur in attachiamentis et emende ibidem capiantur ad opus domini regis. Et omnes alie transgressiones foreste facte extra assisam foreste et contra magnam cartam de foresta decetero placitentur in attachiamentis et emende ibidem capiantur secundum quantitatem transgressionis ad opus domini regis.

6. Item prouisum est quod nullus decetero deferat arcus vel sagittas in foresta nisi sit forestarius iuratus extra viam regiam. Et si in via regia tunc deferat secundum assisam foreste. Nec aliquis aliquem attachiat nisi sit forestarius iuratus vel minister qui sacramentum prestiterit coram iusticiariis.

7. Item prouisum est quod si quis manens extra forestam agistauerit sua animalia infra dominica domini regis in landis boscis et hayis sine waranto vel cum wardo facto, quorumcumque fuerint animalia in eisdem inuenta, et per forestarios domini regis iuratos capta, apprecientur coram viridariis ; et illud precium eisdem viridariis liberetur vel villatis propinquioribus ad respondendum coram iusticiariis in itinere.

8. Item prouisum est quod omnimode transgressiones in forinsecis boscis extra dominicum boscum domini regis inuente per forestarios domini regis iuratos per eosdem forestarios attachientur, et in attachiamentis implacitentur, nisi sint placita que pertinent ad iter iusticiariorum.

9. Et quia euidenter constat iusticiariis in itinere predicto, quod tam magna oneracio regardatorum in foresta predicta non est sustinenda propter magnum domini regis dampnum nec permittenda, prouisum est quod decetero non sint in ista foresta nisi tantummodo duodecim regardatores ; et quod illi regardatores faciant regardum per totam forestam, quociens assisa foreste voluerit.

10. Item prouisum est de hiis qui noctanter et in mense vetito capti fuerint, quod fiat de eis sicut prius fieri consueuit.

attachment for the use of the lord king, unless it be for a sapling which is of a greater price than fourpence; and if it be of a greater price, then he is to be attached until the next eyre, as is aforesaid.

5. Also it is provided that escapes of beasts of the plough in the demesne enclosures and woods be pleaded in the attachments; and amends are there to be taken for the use of the lord king. And all other trespasses to the forest outside the assize of the forest and against the great charter of the forest are in future to be pleaded in the attachments; and amends are there to be taken according to the quantity of the trespass for the use of the lord king.

6. Also it is provided that no man in future carry bows or arrows in the forest outside the king's highway, unless he be a sworn forester; and if he carry them in the king's highway, then he is to carry them according to the assize of the forest. And no man is to attach any one in future, unless he be a sworn forester or an officer who has taken the oath before the justices.

7. Also it is provided that if any man dwelling outside the forest agist his animals within the demesnes of the lord king in his lawns, woods or enclosures without warrant or with ward set, whosesoever the animals in them found and taken by the sworn foresters of the lord king may be, they are to be appraised before the verderers, and their price is to be paid to the same verderers or to the neighbouring townships in order that they may make answer therefor before the justices in eyre.

8. Also it is provided that all kinds of trespasses discovered in the outlying woods outside the demesne woods of the lord king by the sworn foresters of the lord king, be attached by the same foresters and pleaded in the attachments, unless they be pleas which belong to the eyre of the justices.

9. And because it is manifest to the justices in the eyre aforesaid that so great a burden of regarders in the forest aforesaid is not to be endured, on account of the great loss to the lord king, and ought not to be permitted, it is provided that in future there be in this forest twelve regarders only; and that those regarders make the regard through the whole forest as often as the assize of the forest intend.

10. Also it is provided concerning those who are taken by night and in the fence month, that it be done with them as was formerly wont to be done.

IX. (b).[1]

PLACITA FORESTE DE SHIREWOD' TENTA APUD NOTINGHAM DIE LUNE[2] PROXIMA POST FESTUM SANCTI GEORGII ANNO REGNI REGIS EDWARDI TERCII POST CONQUESTUM OCTAUO CORAM RADULFO DE NEUILL', RICARDO DE ALDEBURGH' ET PETRO DE MIDDLETON' IUSTICIARIIS DOMINI REGIS ITINERANTIBUS AD PLACITA FORESTE PER MANDATUM DOMINI REGIS IN HEC VERBA :—

Edwardus dei gracia rex Angl' dominus Hibern' et dux Aquit' archiepiscopis, episcopis, abbatibus, prioribus, comitibus, baronibus, militibus, forestariis, viridariis, agistatoribus, regardatoribus et omnibus aliis de comitatu Notingham salutem. Sciatis quod constituimus dilectos et fideles nostros Radulfum de Neuill' et Ricardum de Aldeburgh' et Petrum de Middelton' et duos eorum iusticiarios nostros ad itinerandum hac vice ad placita foreste in comitatu predicto. Et ideo vobis mandamus quod eidem Radulfo, Ricardo, Petro uel duobus eorum tanquam iusticiariis nostris ad placita foreste ibidem in omnibus que ad placita illa pertinent intendentes sitis et respondentes sicut in aliis itineribus ad placita foreste in comitatu predicto fieri consueuit. In cuius rei testimonium has literas nostras fieri fecimus patentes.

Teste me ipso apud Ebor' secundo[3] die Marcii anno regni nostri octauo.

. . . .

[4] Presentatum est et conuictum per eosdem quod Hugo de Wotehale de Wodeburgh', Willelmus Hyend', Wilkock' quondam seruiens persone de Clifton' et Stephanus Flemyng' de Notingham die[5] Iouis proxima post festum sancti Willelmi archiepiscopi anno regni regis Edwardi filii regis Edwardi decimo octauo fuerunt in bosco de Arnale in loco qui dicitur Throwys cum arcubus et sagittis ; et bersauerunt vnum ceruum, vnde habuit mortem ; et carnes inuente fuerunt putride et per vermes deuorate in loco qui dicitur Thweycehilli ; et sagitta inuenta fuit in dicto ceruo vnde fuit bersatus. Et predictus Hugo venit coram insticiariis et liberatur prisone. Et predicti Willelmus et Wilkock'

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 132.

[2] 25 April 1334.

[3] 2 March 133¾.

[4] Roll 5.

[5] 13 June 1325.

IX. (b).

PLEAS OF THE FOREST OF SHERWOOD HELD AT NOTTINGHAM ON THE MONDAY [2] NEXT AFTER THE FEAST OF ST. GEORGE IN THE EIGHTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD, THE THIRD AFTER THE CONQUEST, BEFORE RALPH DE NEVILLE, RICHARD OF ALDBOROUGH, AND PETER OF MIDDLETON, JUSTICES OF THE LORD KING IN EYRE FOR PLEAS OF THE FOREST BY THE MANDATE OF THE LORD KING IN THESE WORDS:—

Edward, by the grace of God, king of England, Lord of Ireland and Duke of Aquitaine, to the archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons, knights, foresters, verderers, agisters, regarders, and all others of the county of Nottingham, greeting. Know ye that we have appointed our well beloved and trusty Ralph de Neville and Richard of Aldborough and Peter of Middleton and two of them our justices in eyre this time for pleas of the forest in the county aforesaid. And therefore we send you word that to the same Ralph, Richard, Peter, or two of them, as to our justices for pleas of the forest there, in all things which belong to those pleas you be intendent and respondent as has been wont to happen in other eyres for pleas of the forest in the county aforesaid. In witness whereof we have caused these our letters to be made patent. Witness myself at York, the second day of March, [3] in the eighth year of our reign.

. . . .

It is presented and proved by the same persons that Hugh of Wotehale of Woodborough, William Hyend, Wilcock, formerly the servant of the parson of Clifton and Stephen Fleming of Nottingham on the Thursday [5] next after the feast of St. William the archbishop in the eighteenth year of the reign of king Edward the son of king Edward were in the wood of Arnold, in the place which is called Throwys, with bows and arrows. And they shot a hart so that it died. And its flesh was found putrid and devoured by vermin in a place which is called Thweycehilli; and the arrow was found in the said hart, wherewith it was shot. And the aforesaid Hugh came before the justices and is sent to prison. And the aforesaid William

non sunt inuenti, nec aliquid habent per quod etc.,[1] nec prius etc.,[2]
exigantur. nec scitur [1] etc., ideo exigantur. Et predictus Stephanus Flemyng'
mortuus. mortuus est; ideo de eo nichil. Et postea predictus Hugo eductus
condonatur. est a prisona, et condonatur quia pauper. Et predicti Willelmus et
vtlagati. Wilkoc exacti fuerunt in comitatu et non comparuerunt; ideo vtlagati sunt.

. . . .

[3] Quesitum est ab omnibus ministris foreste super sacramentum suum a quo vel quibus forestarii domini regis debent et solebant capere et habere sustentacionem suam; qui dicunt quod Edwardus rex auus domini regis nunc inter alia hoc fecit inquirere per breue suum missum Willelmo [4] de Vescy, tunc iusticiario foreste, cuius transcriptum ostenderunt hic in hec verba:—

[5] Edwardus dei gracia rex Angl' dominus Hibern' et dux Aquit' dilecto et fideli suo Willelmo de Vescy iusticiario foreste sue vltra Trentam salutem. Volentes certiorari per vos vtrum balliuam illam quam Robertus de Eueringham iam defunctus habuit in foresta nostra de Shirewode nobis per vos et socios vestros ante mortem prefati Roberti propter delictum [6] ipsius adiudicatam donare possumus et quantum balliua [7] eadem in omnibus exitibus valeat et in quibus rebus consistat, vobis mandamus quod per sacramentum proborum et legalium hominum per quos rei veritas melius sciri [8] poterit et per inspeccionem rotulorum vestrorum, inquiratis super predictis omnibus [9] et singulis veritatem et inquisicionem inde distincte et aperte factam nobis sub sigillo vestro mittatis et hoc breue. Teste me ipso apud Condom' in Gascon' octauo die Aprilis anno regni nostri decimo septimo.

Vnde fuit facta inquisicio apud Notingham coram prefato Willelmo de Vescy die [10] Martis proxima ante Pentecosten anno regni regis Edwardi decimo septimo per . . . [11] viridarios foreste de Shirwode . . . [12] regardatores eiusdem foreste . . . [13] agistatores eiusdem foreste et per duodecim iuratores predictis ministris adiunctos, videlicet, . . . [14];

[1] See note 6, p. 62.

[2] The 'etc.' represents 'se reddiderunt' or perhaps 'attachiati fuerunt.'

[3] Roll 9 d.

[4] William de Vescy was appointed justice of the forest north of the Trent by letters patent dated 30 June 1285. See Pat. Roll, No. 103, memb. 12.

[5] The original inquisition is at the Public Record Office; the reference to it is *Inquisition. post Mortem*' 15 *Ed. i. No.* 28.

[6] The rolls of the eyre of 15 Ed. i. contain many cases of trespasses against venison, by Robert of Everingham.

[7] MS. 'balliuam.'

[8] MS. 'scire.'

[9] MS. hominibus.

[10] 24 May 1289.

[11] Six names.

[12] Nine names.

[13] Four names.

[14] Twelve names.

and Wilcock are not found. Nor have they anything whereby etc.; nor were they before etc.; nor is it known etc.; therefore let them be exacted. And the aforesaid Stephen Fleming is dead; therefore nothing of him. And afterwards the aforesaid Hugh is brought out of prison, and is pardoned because he is poor. And the aforesaid William and Wilcock were exacted in the county and did not appear; therefore they are outlawed.

. . . .

All the ministers of the forest are asked upon their oath from what person or persons the foresters of the lord king ought and were wont to receive and have their living. And they say that king Edward, the grandfather of the lord king who now is, among other things caused an inquiry to be made by his writ, sent to William de Vescy then justice of the forest, the transcript of which they showed here in these words:—

Edward by the grace of God, king of England, lord of Ireland and duke of Aquitaine, to his trusty and well beloved William de Vescy, justice of his forest beyond Trent, greeting. Wishing to be certified by you whether we can give that bailiwick which Robert of Everingham, now deceased, had in our forest of Sherwood and which was adjudged to us by you and your fellows before the death of the aforesaid Robert by reason of his misdeeds, and how much the same bailiwick is worth with all its issues, and of what things it consists; we command you that by the oath of good and loyal men, by whom the truth of the matter can best be known, and by the inspection of your rolls you cause the truth to be inquired concerning all and singular the aforesaid things, and the inquisition plainly and openly made thereof, you do send to us under your seal, and this writ. Witness myself at Condon in Gascony, on the eighth day of April, in the seventeenth year of our reign,

Whereof an inquisition was made at Nottingham before the aforesaid William de Vescy on the Tuesday [10] next before Whitsunday in the seventeenth year of the reign of king Edward by . . . verderers of the forest of Sherwood, . . . regarders of the same forest, . . . agisters of the same forest, and by twelve jurors associated to the aforesaid ministers, to wit . . .

Qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod Robertus de Eueringham racione balliue sue debuit fugare leporem, vulpem, scurellum et catum in foresta.

Item dicunt quod debuit habere corticem et couporones quercuum quas dominus rex dederat de dominicis boscis suis per breue suum.

Item dicunt quod debet habere retropannagium quociens contigerit.

Item dicunt quod debuit habere expeditacionem canum non expeditatorum, videlicet de quolibet cane non expeditato tres solidos de tribus annis in tres annos quando breue domini regis venit ad regardum faciendum.

Item dicunt quod de molis cariatis quando transierunt per forestam habuit per annum viginti solidos.

Item dicunt quod tenuit decem feoda militum de domino rege in capite de quorum seruicio exoneratus fuit propter custodiam foreste et ad inueniendos forestarios suos sumptibus suis propriis.

Item dicunt quod omnes terre sue quas[1] habuit in foresta sunt extra regardum racione balliue sue et omnes canes de feodo suo non erunt expeditati.

Item dicunt quod balliua predicti Roberti abiudicata[2] fuit de se et heredibus suis imperpetuum in vltimo itinere Willelmi de Vescy et sociorum suorum iusticiariorum domini regis ad placita foreste apud Notingham itinerancium pro pluribus defaltis de quibus fuit conuictus in eodem itinere; per quod dominus rex balliuam forestarii feodi de Shirewode potest conferre cuicunque sibi placuerit.

In cuius rei testimonium predicti ministri et alii iurati presenti inquisicioni sigilla sua apposuerunt.

Et dicunt quod nesciunt aliud dicere nisi quod predicti iurati dicebant. Et sic ponitur in respectu.

. . . .

[3] **Rotulus de amerciamentis de conuictis in attachiamentis de transgressionibus viridis vltra precium quatuor denariorum et que non potuerunt amerciari nisi in itinere.**

Misericordia [illegible] s. De Radulfo filio Reginaldi de Edenestowe pro vna quercu decem denariorum, vnde viridarii sunt onerati in rotulo de precio viridis. Et pro transgressione in misericordia nunc in itinere. Plegii Ricardus de Normanton' et Ricardus Godard' de Thouresby.

[1] MS. 'que.' [2] MS. 'adiudicata. [3] Extracts from rolls 11 to 14.

Who say upon their oath that Robert of Everingham by reason of his bailiwick had the right to hunt the hare, the fox, the squirrel and the cat in the forest.

And they say that he had the right to have the bark and the crops of oaks which the lord king had given from his demesne woods by his writ.

And they say that he has the right to have after-pannage, as often as it occurs.

And they say that he had the right to have the lawing of dogs not lawed; that is to say, from every dog not lawed three shillings every three years, when the writ of the lord king comes to make a regard.

And they say that he had of millstones when they were carried through the forest twenty shillings a year.

And they say that he held ten knights' fees in chief of the lord king, from the service of which he was exonerated on account of his custody of the forest and in return for finding his foresters at his own cost.

And they say that all his lands which he held in the forest are outside the regard by reason of his bailiwick; and no dogs of his fee shall be lawed.

And they say that the bailiwick of the aforesaid Robert was adjudged away from him and his heirs for ever in the last eyre of William de Vescy and his fellow justices of the lord king, itinerating at Nottingham for pleas of the forest, for many defaults of which he was convicted in the same eyre; wherefore the lord king can confer the bailiwick of the forester in fee of Sherwood, on whomsoever it please him.

In witness whereof the aforesaid ministers and other jurors have put their seals to this present inquisition.

And they say that they cannot say aught else than what the aforesaid jurors said. And so the matter is respited.

. . . .

Roll of amercements of persons convicted in the attachments of trespasses against the vert appraised at more than fourpence; and which cannot be amerced except in the eyre.

ercy ij s. Of Ralph the son of Reynold of Edwinstowe for an oak, of the price of tenpence, wherewith the verderers are charged in the roll of the price of the vert. And for the trespass, he is now in mercy in the eyre. His pledges are Richard of Normanton and Richard Godard of Thoresby.

misericordia ij s. De Ricardo filio Ricardi de Hibern' de Mamesfeld' pro vna quercu, precii duodecim denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.[1]

misericordia ij s. De Reginaldo filio Galfridi de Thoresby pro vna stobe precii octo denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia xviij d. De Nicholao Bateman de Boteby pro vna blestrone, precii sex denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia xviij d. De Radulfo Molendinario de Sutton' pro trescentum lattarum, precii duodecim denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia xviij d. De Iohanne super moram de Warsepe pro vna carectata maeremie, precii sex denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia xviij d. De Waltero le Norreys de Blitheworth' pro truncacione vnius quercus, precii sex denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia ij s. De Hugone ad Pontem de eadem pro stoches, precii octo denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia ij s. De Ricardo filio Galfridi filii Iuonis de eadem pro cheueronibus, precii decem denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia xviij d. De Nicholao Payne de Warsop pro vno ramo, sex denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia ij s. De Iohanne filio Willelmi de Thoure pro vna quercu viride, precii decem et octo denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia xij d. De Gilberto Fadir et Gileberto Gilling' pro melle asportato de bosco, precii sex denariorum, vnde viridarii, etc.

misericordia ij s. De Thoma Sheth de Mamesfeld' pro vna domo vendita.

. . . .

[2] De precio viridis; et amerciamenta viridariorum quia non habuerunt rotulos de tempore suo.

De viridariis anno regis Edwardi aui domini regis nunc quinto decimo de precio viridis de attachiamentis de Maunnesfeld' de eodem anno . . . . vj s. v d.

De eisdem viridariis quia non habuerunt rotulos de attachiamentis de Lindeby, Bulwell', Caluerton et Eden' de eodem anno; in misericordia . . . . x s.

De viridariis de anno eiusdem regis sextodecimo de precio viridis de attachiamentis de Caluerton' et Mamesfeld' de eodem anno . . . . xxv s. v d.

[1] There are about 738 entries similar to this; and 43 and 34 similar to the two following entries respectively. After each entry the names of two pledges are written on the roll. Of the remaining entries there are generally only two or three of each kind.

[2] Roll 15.

mercy ij s. Of Richard the son of Richard of Ireland of Mansfield for one oak of the price of twelvepence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy ij s. Of Reynold the son of Geoffrey of Thoresby for one stub of the price of eightpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy xviij d. Of Nicholas Bateman of Boteby for one sapling, of the price of sixpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy xviij d. Of Ralph the miller of Sutton for three hundred laths, of the price of twelvepence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy xviij d. Of John on the moor of Warsop for a cartload of timber, of the price of sixpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy xviij d. Of Walter le Norreys of Blidworth for cutting the trunk of an oak, of the price of sixpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy ij s. Of Hugh atte Bridge of the same town for stocks of the price of eightpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy ij s. Of Richard the son of Geoffrey the son of Ives of the same town for chevrons of the price of tenpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy xviij d. Of Nicholas Payne of Warsop for one branch, of the price of sixpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy ij s. Of John the son of William of Thoure for a green oak, of the price of eighteen pence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy xij d. Of Gilbert Fadir and Gilbert Gilling for honey carried away from the wood, of the price of sixpence, wherewith the verderers, etc.

mercy ij s. Of Thomas Sheth of Mansfield for a house sold.

. . . .

Of the price of vert; and the amercements of the verderers, because they did not produce the rolls of their time.

Of the verderers in the fifteenth year of the reign of King Edward, the grandfather of the lord king who now is, for the price of the vert of the attachments of Mansfield for the same year, six shillings and five pence.

Of the same verderers because they did not produce the rolls of the attachments of Linby, Bulwell, Calverton and Edwinstowe for the same year; in mercy ten shillings.

Of the verderers of the sixteenth year of the same king for the price of the vert of the attachments of Calverton and Mansfield for the same year, twenty-five shillings and fivepence.

De eisdem viridariis quia non habuerunt rotulos de attachiamentis de Lindeby, Bulewell' et Eden' de eodem anno; in misericordia . . . . xx s.

De viridariis de anno eiusdem regis septimo decimo de precio viridis de attachiamentis de eodem anno . . lxxiij s. vij d.

De viridariis de anno eiusdem regis decimo octauo de precio viridis de attachiamentis de Bulwell', Caluerton', Mam' et Eden' de eodem anno . . . . lxxij s. ix d.

De eisdem viridariis quia non habuerunt rotulos de attachiamentis de Lindeby de eodem anno; in misericordia . . . v s.

X. (a).[1]

[INQUISICIONES DE UENACIONE IN FORESTA DE ESSEX'.][2]

Die Dominica proxima post festum sancte Osithe[3] anno regni regis Henrici vicesimo secundo ibat Simon filius Norman' per balliam suam de Kingeswod' et vidit ibidem bene sexdecim homines pedites et duo equites cum arcubus et sagittis; et statim ut illos vidisset leuauit super illos clamorem; et statim postea venerunt duo equites et ipsum assultauerunt et verberauerunt, et ei plagas inposuerunt; et postea venerunt predicti sexdecim homines pedites et abstulerunt ab eo cornu suum et gladium frenum supercengulam[4] suam. Et cum predictus Simon esset euasus a manibus eorum ibat querere viridarios; et statim venerunt cum hominibus visneti et querebant illos predictos homines in predicta foresta et illos inuenire non potuerunt. Et postea [conuener]unt foristarii et viridarii ad melius certificandum iusticiarios foreste in aduentu suo; et fecerunt inquisicionem per quatuor villatas, scilicet, Diham, Boxsted', Ardleg', Laingeham,[5] que dicunt quod ad presens nichil sciunt, set ma[gnam] diligenciam apponent istud inquirendi.

[1] From the Add. Roll 28404 at the British Museum. The importance of these inquisitions lies in the fact that they are the earliest of the reign of Henry iii. which are to be found in any public library. It is possible that others may exist in private collections.

[2] The MS. has no descriptive heading.

[3] 6 June 1238.

[4] The word in the MS. is written 's*up*er-cenlg*u*lam,' the letters in italics being represented there by marks of contraction.

[5] This word might also be read as Ladingeham or Ledingeham.

Of the same verderers because they did not produce the rolls of the attachments of Linby, Bulwell and Edwinstowe for the same year; in mercy twenty shillings.

Of the verderers of the seventeenth year of the same king for the price of the vert of the attachments for the same year, seventy-three shillings and sevenpence.

Of the verderers of the eighteenth year of the same king for the price of the vert of the attachments of Bulwell, Calverton, Mansfield and Edwinstowe for the same year, seventy-two shillings and ninepence.

Of the same verderers, because they did not produce the rolls of the attachments of Linby for the same year; in mercy five shillings.

X. (a).

INQUISITIONS CONCERNING THE VENISON IN THE FOREST OF ESSEX.

On the Sunday next after the feast of St. Osithe [3] in the twenty-second year of the reign of king Henry Simon the son of Norman was going through his bailiwick of Kingswood, and he saw there full sixteen men on foot and two on horseback with bows and arrows; and as soon as ever he saw them he raised the cry upon them. And immediately afterwards the two men on horseback came, and assaulted him and beat him, and wounded him. And afterwards the aforesaid sixteen men on foot came and took away from him his horn and his sword, his bit and his surcingle. And when the aforesaid Simon had escaped from their hands he went to seek the verderers; and immediately they came with men of the neighbourhood and sought those aforesaid men in the aforesaid forest, and they could not find them. And afterwards the foresters and verderers assembled for the purpose of better certifying the justices of the forest on their coming. And they made an inquisition by four townships, to wit, Dedham, Boxsted, Ardleigh, and Langham, who say that at present they know nothing; but they will use great diligence in inquiring into this.

Die[1] sancti Thome martiris anno regni regis Henrici vicesimo quarto[2] equitabant per forestam de [Hyneholt] Gilebertus Dun forestarius et Robertus [eius] seruiens; et viderunt octo h[omines cum ar]cubus et sagittis et cum leporariis in eadem foresta; et ipse Gilebertus mandauit . . .[3]; et ipsi simul[4] venerunt in crastino in predicta foresta et viderunt h[omines] pred[ictos; et] leuauerunt [super illos] clamorem et secuti sunt eos; et ipsi fugauerunt; et nesciebant vbi deuenerunt. Homines uero [hospi]tati[5] erant ad domum Ricardi filii Petri Lond' apud Wodeford'. Et ad melius certificandum iusticiarios foreste in aduentu suo conuenerunt foristarii et viridarii et [fecerunt] inquisicionem per quatuor villatas proximas, scilicet, Berking', Stapelford' Abbatis, Lamburn, Wensted' . . . que dicunt quod nichil sciunt.

Catalla inuenta ad domum predictam quadraginta oues, octo quarteria auene, precium ouium una marca, precium auene dimidia marca. Et committitur precium Alexandro de ponte, Thome de ponte de Wodeford', Salomoni filio Radulfi de Berking', Ernulpho de Tyheye de eadem, Briano filio Osberti de Chigewell', Rogero de Hache de eadem.

Plegii Simonis filii Conis de Chigewell', qui primo mane inuenit homines predictos, Nicholaus filius Osberti et Eudo piscator de eadem.

[6] Goscelinus de ponte de Wodeford ponatur per vadium et saluos plegios quod sit ad proximum hundredum foreste, quia non fuit apud La Claya ad inquisicionem vnde habetur suspectus.

Perdonatur per fratrem Nicholaum de Wodeford'.

Iohannes filius Rogeri, wodeward de Chigewell', dicit quod cum ibat in bosco de Hyneholt' die[1] sancti Thome martiris anno regni regis Henrici vicesimo quarto vidit septem homines quinque cum arcubus et sagittis et duos cum quatuor leporariis [quorum tres habuerunt viseria] et istud ostendit Rogero patri suo; et idem Rogerus peciit ab eo si agno[uisset] eos. Ipse respondit quod Iohannes le Blund de Edelmeton' erat vnus ex eis. Et dixit quod agnouit eum quod anno preterito vidit eum sepe venientem ad videndum porcos suos quos habuit in bosco predicto in pannagio.[7]

Rogerus predictus dicit quod, si deus eum adiuuet, malecredit Iohannem predictum de foresta domini regis.

[1] 29 December 1239.

[2] The right hand side of the roll is very much damaged. All words in square brackets are supplied by conjecture, there being no trace of them left in the MS.

[3] The missing words are probably 'propter homines suos.'

[4] MS. 'semul.'

[5] This word might also be 'receptati.'

[6] This paragraph has been cancelled in the MS.

[7] The word 'pessone' seems to have been written before 'pannagio' and crossed out.

On the day[1] of St. Thomas the Martyr in the twenty-fourth year of the reign of king Henry Gilbert Dun the forester and Robert his servant were riding through the forest of Hainhault; and they saw eight men with bows and arrows and greyhounds in the same forest. And the same Gilbert sent word (for others to come); and they went together on the morrow into the aforesaid forest and saw the aforesaid men; and they raised the cry upon them, and followed them and put them to flight; and they did not know what became of them. But the men were harboured at the house of Richard the son of Peter of London at Woodford. And for the purpose of better certifying the justices of the forest on their coming, the foresters and verderers assembled and made an inquisition by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Barking, Stapleford Abbots, Lambourne and Wanstead, . . . which say that they know nothing.

The chattels found at the house aforesaid were forty sheep and eight quarters of oats, the price of the sheep being one mark, and the price of the oats half a mark. And the price is entrusted to Alexander atte Bridge, Thomas atte Bridge of Woodford, Solomon the son of Ralph of Barking, Ernulph of Tyheye of the same town, Brian the son of Osbert of Chigwell and Roger of Hach of the same town.

Pledges of Simon the son of Conis of Chigwell, who in the early morning found the aforesaid men, Nicholas the son of Osbert and Eudes the fisher of the same town.

Let Goscelin atte Bridge of Woodford be put by gage and safe pledges to be at the next forest hundred because he was not at La Cleye at the inquisition; wherefore he is suspected.

He is pardoned at the request of Brother Nicholas of Woodford.

John the son of Roger the woodward of Chigwell says that when he was on his way in the wood of Hainhault on the day of St. Thomas the Martyr in the twenty-fourth year of the reign of king Henry, he saw seven men, five with bows and arrows and two with four greyhounds, of whom three had masks, and he showed this to Roger his father; and the same Roger asked him if he recognised the men. He replied that John le Blund of Edmonton was one of them. And he said he recognised him because in the past year he often saw him coming to see his pigs which he had in the wood aforesaid for pannage.

The aforesaid Roger says that, so help him God, he suspects the aforesaid John with regard to the forest of the lord king.

Iohannes wodeward de Lamburn' dicit quod malecredit personam de Stapelford quia sepe vidit eum euntem cum leporariis in foresta domini regis.

Simon filius Conis de Chigewell' dicit quod cum in aurora diei sancti Thome martiris venisset ad domum domini sui, scilicet, Ricardi filii Petri in Wodeford' pro vna quarteria auene et tribus pellibus ouium ad asportandum ad Lond' et uenisset ad hostium predicte domus exierunt duo homines cum arcubus et sagittis, et ipsum ceperunt et affidare fecerunt quod nichil de eis alicui ostenderet; et quod incontinenti iret iter suum, quod[1] primo habuit primo inpropositum iturum, et bene sequebantur eum vnam quarentenam dicentes ei quod si reuertisset durissime punirent.[2]

X. (b).[3]

[4] **Apud Hadfeld Regis. Attachiamenta venacionis post vltima placita.**

Contigit die[5] Dominica in octabis sancti Hillarii anno regni regis Henrici filii regis Iohannis vicesimo quinto quod Clemens Godcop gradiens uersus monasterium de Hadfeld' Regis vidit vnum damum iacentem mortuum in campo Agnetis de Bosco qui vocatur Estfeld'; et statim nunciauit Galfrido de Barenton' foristario qui mandauit foristariis et viridariis ad inquisicionem faciendam per quatuor villatas,[6] scilicet, Hadfeld' Regis, Hallingebir' I. de Burgo, Hallingebir' de Neuill' et Kaneueles Comitisse.

Villata de Hadfeud dicit quod nichil scit nec audiuit per quod damus ille debuit mori nisi per morinam, quia fuit absque plaga sicut eis videbatur et fere detractus cum[7] porcis.

Villata de Kaneueles idem dicit.

Villata de Hallingebir' de Burgo idem dicit.

Villata de Hallingebir' de Neuill' idem dicit.

Decena Ricardi Child' et Rogeri Haldheued manuceperunt villatam

[1] The correct transcription of this relative clause is very doubtful. The word 'primo' following 'quod' might be read as 'primum'; the word 'primo' following 'habuit' is interlineated and might be read in several ways; and the word 'iturum' is also interlineated, but it is clearly written.

[2] MS. 'puniret.'

[3] From the Add. Roll 28405 at the British Museum.

[4] The first three words are at the head of the document, but the last five are placed on the outside, so as to appear when it is rolled up.

[5] 20 January 124$\frac{0}{1}$.

[6] Now called Hatfield Broadoak, Great Hallingbury, Little Hallingbury, and Great Canfield respectively. The manor of Great Canfield was the property of Hugh de Vere, Earl of Oxford, who died in 1263. At the date of the above inquisition it was probably held by his mother, Isabel the widow of Robert de Vere, in dower.

[7] See note 4, p. 62 above.

John, the woodward of Lambourne, says that he suspects the parson of Stapleford because he often saw him going with greyhounds in the forest of the lord king.

Simon the son of Conis of Chigwell says that when he came at the dawn of St. Thomas the Martyr to the house of his lord Richard the son of Peter in Woodford for a quarter of oats and three sheepskins to take away to London, and had reached the door of the aforesaid house, two men came out with bows and arrows and seized him and made him pledge faith that he would show nothing of them to anybody, and that he would forthwith go the way that he first proposed to go; and they followed him a full furlong saying to him that if he returned they would punish him severely.

X. (b).

At Hatfield Regis. Attachments of the venison since the last pleas . . .

It happened on Sunday[5] the octave of St. Hilary in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of king Henry the son of king John that Clement Godcup on his way to the monastery of Hatfield Regis saw a buck lying dead in the field of Agnes de Bois, which is called Eastfield; and forthwith he announced the fact to Geoffrey de Barentin, the forester, who sent word to the foresters and verderers to make inquisition by four townships, to wit, Hatfield Regis, Hallingbury John of Burgh, Hallingbury Neville, and Canfield Countess.

The township of Hatfield says that it knows nothing nor has heard how that buck can have died, except of murrain; for it was without any sore, as they thought, and almost dragged to pieces by the pigs.

The township of Canfield says the same.

The township of Hallingbury Burgh says the same.

The township of Hallingbury Neville says the same.

The tithing of Richard Child and Roger Haldhead were main-

de Hadfeld' adessendi coram iusticiariis foreste ad prima placita ad eos certificandos super iam dicta fera mortua inuenta.

Decena Willelmi de Beuchaump et Iordani filii Mauricii manuceperunt villatam de Kaneueles pro eodem.

Decena Roberti de Lucy et Rogeri de Lucy manuceperunt villatam de Hallingebir' de Burgo pro eodem.

Decena Reginaldi de Kastenho et Rogeri de Bosco manuceperunt villatam de Hallingebir' de Neuill' pro eodem.

Quatuor vicini proximi, Ricardus Child', Reginaldus le Waunt', Philippus Mose et Clemens Hut.

Plegii Ricardi Child' adessendi coram iusticiariis ad prima placita foreste, Michaelis filius Radulfi et Petrus filius Willelmi.

Plegii Reginaldi le Waunt' pro eodem Galfridus filius Michaelis et Willelmus de Haselingefeld'.

Plegii Philippi Mose pro eodem Willelmus le Leuetaing et Walterus le Neweman.

Plegii Clementis Hut pro eodem Reginaldus Strangowe et Rogerus filius Wydonis.

Plegii Clementis Godcop inuentoris adessendi coram iusticiariis foreste Willelmus le Boteiler et Stephanus filius Ernulphi.

Plegii Agnetis de Bosco in cuius campo dictus damus inuentus fuit mortuus adessendi coram iusticiariis foreste Ricardus Dukehar' et Iohannes Arnwy.

Capud et cornu comittuntur Ricardo Child' usque ad prima placita foreste.

alibi. Accidit apud Wodeham Ferr' die [1] sancte Marie Magdalene anno regni regis Henrici vicesimo quinto quod cum parcarius domini W. de Ferr' iuit in parco de Wodeham vidit ibi homines cum arcubus et sagittis. Et ipse fugit ab eis et mandauit bailliuum hundredi ; et ipse villatas proximas, que [2] venerunt et circuerunt parcum predictum ; et plures intrauerunt. Et venerunt sexdecim homines de parco predicto cum arcubus et sagittis, sicut predictum est, et tulerunt venacionem quatuor bestiarum et transierunt de illo parco usque in parcum episcopi Elyens' in Retindon'. Et ipsi leuauerunt super [eos] huthesium et ad clamorem illum venerunt forestarii de eadem baillia et inuenerunt Reginaldum filium Baddewin' de Barling' cum quodam

[1] 22 July 1241. [2] MS. 'qui.'

perners of the township of Hatfield being before the justices of the forest at the next pleas to certify them upon the aforesaid deer which was found dead.

The tithing of William de Beauchamp and Jordan the son of Maurice were mainperners of the township of Canfield for the same.

The tithing of Robert de Luci and Roger de Luci were mainperners of the township of Hallingbury Burgh for the same.

The tithing of Reynold of Kastenho and Roger de Bois were mainperners of Hallingbury Neville for the same.

The four nearest neighbours were Richard Child, Reynold le Waunter, Philip Mose, and Clement Hut.

The pledges of Richard Child being before the justices at the first pleas of the forest—Michael the son of Ralph and Peter the son of William.

The pledges of Reynold le Waunter for the same—Geoffrey the son of Michael and William of Haslingfield.

The pledges of Philip Mose for the same—William le Levetaing and Walter le Neweman.

The pledges of Clement Hut for the same—Reynold Strangowe and Roger the son of Guy.

The pledges of Clement Godcup, the finder of the buck, being before the justices of the forest—William le Boteiler and Stephen the son of Ernulph.

The pledges of Agnes de Bois, in whose field the said buck was found dead, being before the justices of the forest—Richard Dukehare and John Arnwy.

The head and the antlers are entrusted to Richard Child until the next pleas of the forest.

It happened at Woodham Ferrers on the day [2] of St. Mary Magdalene in the twenty-fifth year of the reign of king Henry that when the parker of Sir William de Ferrières went into the park of Woodham he saw there men with bows and arrows. And he fled from them, and sent word to the bailiff of the hundred, and the bailiff did the same to the neighbouring townships, who came and surrounded the park aforesaid, and several men entered it. And sixteen men came out of the park aforesaid with bows and arrows as is aforesaid, and they carried the venison of four beasts; and they crossed from that park into the park of the bishop of Ely at Rettenden. And they raised the hue upon them; and at the cry the foresters of the same bailiwick came; and they found Reynold the son of Baldwin of Barling with a certain

cane nigro ad domum Galfridi Ioie; et interrogauerunt eum quis esset. Dixit quod fuit cum Simone Perdriz. Et qui sunt illi qui sunt in parco de Wodeham? Dixit quod Simon Perdriz dominus meus, Iacobus de Estwode, Petrus, persona de Essendon' et Thomas frater eius, Robertus Strech de hospicio comitis Kanc', Bateman Prelle de Colecestr', Willelmus de Bouill', miles, Robertus de Strecford' Galfridus de Amblye, Willelmus frater eius, Thomas Puintel. Et predictus Reginaldus, pro confessione sua et magna suspeccione transgressionis foreste, captus fuit et missus ad prisonam Colec'; et postea per breue domini Iohannis[1] filii Galfridi, tunc iusticiarii foreste, fuit deliberatus per ballium Rogero de Hyda de Raleg', Willelmo le Blund' de Burgested', Iohanni Rufferi de Ginges, Iohanni le Brun de Haningefeud, Iohanni Malegreffe de Hormudon, Iohanni Crikes de Wodeham, Stephano de Wikford', Iohanni de Curingeham, Ricardo le Yepe de Ragere, Waltero de Sussex' de Dunton', Ade de Leyndon', Galfrido de Langedon'.

Et Simon Perdriz nec alii non habent terras neque catalla infra metas foreste Essex' per quod possent attachiari.

Die[2] Sabbati proxima ante Natiuitatem beate Virginis anno regni regis Henrici vicesimo sexto venit Willelmus Waybard in Horsfrith' et vidit ibidem Hawe le Escot et tres alios cum eo cum arcubus et sagittis quos non agnouit et decessit ab eis et ibat ad Rogerum de Weulaueston' forestarium, et monstrauit ei qualiter inuenit eos. Et ipse assumptis secum hominibus suis, quesiuit predictum boscum et nichil potuit inuenire. Et ad hoc conuenerunt forestarii et viridarii, et fecerunt inde inquisicionem per quatuor villatas proximas, scilicet, Fingrie, Ginges[3] Abbatisse, Ginges[4] Regine, Writel'.

Fingrie venit et dicit quod nichil scit de malefactoribus foreste nec eorum receptoribus.

Ginges Abbatisse idem dicit.

Ginges Regine idem dicit.

Writel venit et dicit quod audiuit de Willelmo Wayberd' quod ipse die[5] Veneris proxima post Natiuitatem beate Virginis anno eodem vidit duos canes currentes ad vnam damam tesatam ad mortem; vnum

[1] The appointment of John the son of Geoffrey as justice of the forest south of Trent is not recorded upon the Patent or Fine Rolls. He was succeeded in the office by Reynold de Moyon, who was appointed by letters patent dated 1 April 1242. See Patent Roll 49, m. 7.

[2] 6 September 1242.

[3] Now called Ingatestone. It formerly belonged to the Abbess of St. Mary at Barking.

[4] Now called Margaretting.

[5] 12 September 1242.

black dog at the house of Geoffrey Joie, and they asked him who he was. He said, 'that he was with Simon Partridge.' 'And who are they who are in the park of Woodham?' He said, 'Simon Partridge, my master, James of Eastwood, Peter the parson of Ashingdon and Thomas his brother, Robert Strech of the household of the earl of Kent, Bateman Prelle of Colchester, William de Boville, knight, Robert of Stratford, Geoffrey de Amblye, William his brother, Thomas Puintel.' And the aforesaid Reynold on account of his confession and grave suspicion of trespass against the forest was taken and sent to the prison at Colchester; and afterwards he was delivered by the writ of Sir John the son of Geoffrey, then justice of the forest, on bail to Richard de Hyde of Rayleigh, William le Blund of Burstead, John Ruffers of Ing, John le Brun of Hanningfield, John Malegraffe of Horndon, John Crikes of Woodham, Stephen of Wickford, John of Corringham, Richard le Yepe of Ragere, Walter of Sussex of Dunton, Adam of Laindon, and Geoffrey of Langdon.

And Simon Partridge and the others have neither lands nor chattels within the metes of the forest of Essex, by which they can be attached.

On the Saturday [2] next before the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of king Henry William Wayberd came into Horsfrith, and saw there Hawe le Scot and three others with him with bows and arrows; and he did not recognise them; and he left them and went to Roger of Wollaston the forester, and showed him how he found them. And he, taking his men with him, searched the aforesaid wood, and could find nothing. And upon this the foresters and verderers assembled, and made an inquisition thereof by four neighbouring townships, to wit: Fingrith, Abbess' Ing, Queen's Ing, and Writtle.

Fingrith comes and says that it knows nothing of malefactors to the forest nor of persons harbouring them.

Abbess' Ing says the same.

Queen's Ing says the same.

Writtle comes and says that it heard from William Wayberd that on the Friday [5] next after the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin in the same year he saw two dogs running after a buck, which they worried

nigrum vnum verrum; et hoc ostendit Rogero de Welaueston' forestario.

Die [1] Veneris proxima ante festum sancte Margarete anno regni regis Henrici filii regis Iohannis vicesimo sexto summo mane ibat Rogerus de Weulaueston' per medium foreste de Writel'; uidit ibidem vnum paruum mastinum nigrum currentem ad vnum brokettum, et ipse secutus est eum et deposuit eum ab illo broketto.

Preterea idem Rogerus transiens per predictam forestam eodem die uersus domum G. de Segraue,[2] iusticiarii foreste, vidit ibidem quandam damam vulneratam in quissa, ut ei videbatur, quia clossauit; et postea audiuit quoddam cornu quod agnouit, ut . . . cornu Rogeri le Escot hominis domine Isabelle de Brus; et superueniens Willelmus Quintin et audiuit cornu, . . . ibidem effusionem sanguinis. Rogerus le Gilur homo dicti Rogeri fuit ibidem.

XI.[3]

[INQUISITIONES DE UENACIONE IN FORESTA DE HUNT'.]

[4] Anno regni regis Henrici tricesimo secundo die [5] Cynerum inquisicio facta fuit de uno fehune, in bosco de Brampton' inuento, uulnerato vna sagitta, per quatuor villatas, scilicet, Bramptonam, Elinton', Graffham, Dillinton'; que omnes dixerunt quod nichil sciuerunt inde.

[6] Anno eodem die [7] Iouis proxima post [festum] sanctorum Tyburcii et Valleriani inquisicio facta fuit sub Wauberge de quadam bestia capta in prato vnde extima [8] inuenta fuit, et per quatuor villatas scilicet Alcunbiry, Wolle, Elinton' et Brampton', que omnes dicunt quod nichil sciunt.

[1] 18 July 1242.

[2] Gilbert of Seagrave was appointed justice of the forest south of Trent by letters patent dated 6 May 1242. (See Patent Roll 49, m. 2.)

[3] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt, No.* 39 (a). This is part of a roll of inquisitions, upon which the eyre rolls were based. To each entry on this roll there is a corresponding entry on the eyre rolls, extracts from which are printed on pp. 11–26.

[4] See p. 21.

[5] Wednesday, 4 March 124 7/8.

[6] See p. 23 above.

[7] 16 April 1248.

[8] The reading of this word is doubtful. In p. 29 the corresponding word in the record of this case in the eyre is 'intestina,' so that there can be no doubt as to its meaning.

to death, one being black, the other brindled, and he pointed this out to Roger of Wollaston the forester.

On the Friday[1] next before the feast of St. Margaret in the twenty-sixth year of the reign of king Henry the son of king John, Roger of Wollaston was going in the early morning through the middle of the forest of Writtle. He saw there a small black mastiff running after a brocket; and he followed it, and removed it from the brocket.

Furthermore the same Roger passing through the aforesaid forest on the same day towards the house of Gilbert of Seagrave, the justice of the forest, saw there a certain doe wounded in the thigh, as it seemed to him, because it limped; and afterwards he heard a certain horn, which he recognised . . . as the horn of Roger le Scot, the man of the lady Isabel de Brus, and William Quinton coming up also heard the horn; (and they saw) a flowing of blood there. Roger le Gilur, the man of the said Roger, was there.

XI.

[INQUISITIONS CONCERNING THE VENISON IN THE FOREST OF HUNTINGDON.]

In the thirty-second year of the reign of king Henry on Ash Wednesday,[5] an inquisition concerning a fawn, which was found dead and wounded with an arrow in the wood of Brampton, was made by four townships, to wit Brampton, Ellington, Grafham and Dillington, which all say that they knew nothing thereof.

In the same year on the Thursday[7] next after the feast of Saints Tyburcius and Valerian an inquisition concerning a certain beast, which was taken in the meadow, and of which the entrails were found, was made at Weybridge by four townships, to wit, Alconbury, Woolley, Ellington and Brampton, which all say that they know nothing thereof.

[1] Contigit eodem anno die[2] Lune proxima ante festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste, quod quidam Galfridus filius Stephani Swyft de Sibethorp inuentus fuit in Wauberge cum arcu et quinque sagittis; et cognouit quod occidit duos fhoones, et dixit quod Rogerus filius Philippi de Alcunbir' illos habuit. Et forestarii iuerunt ad domum predicti Philippi et inuenerunt illos fhoones. Predicti uero Galfridus et Rogerus ducti fuerunt ad gayolam de Huntedon'. Et quia gayola fracta fuit, ducti fuerunt apud Herford'. Et predictus Philippus traditus fuit per ballium villate de Alcunbiry.

[3] Contigit die[4] Dominica proxima post festum sancti Iohannis Baptiste summo mane in aurora anno regis tricesimo tercio quod cum forestarii de Wauberge et Sappel' vigiliam fecissent de sub Wauberge se obuiauerunt duobus leporariis qui sequti fuerunt vnam bestiam. Et postea venerunt in campo et inuenerunt Stephanum Fot et quemdam Galfridum filium Oseberti messores. Et forestarii ceperunt duos leporarios et predictos S. et G. et duxerunt apud Alcunbiry vsque aduentum viridariorum. Et interim predictus Galfridus euasit a custodia forestariorum. Et predictus Stephanus ductus fuit apud Herford' ad prisonam. Catalla predicti Stephani:—vna vacca, vnum auerium, vnus bouettus. Precium catallorum octo solidi. Predictus G. nullum cattallum habuit. Super hoc inquisicio facta fuit die[5] Martis proxima ante festum sancti Thome martiris per Alcunbiry, Brampt', Wolle, Bukiswrth'. Omnes concordant et dicunt quod nullum habuit suspectum de predictis, nec sciunt vnde leporarii venerunt.

[6] Contigit die[7] Palmarum anno eodem ad vesperas quod cum forestarii de Sappel' vigiliam fecissent sub Sappel' obuiauerunt octo malefactoribus cum leporariis; quos cum forestarii comprehendissent in fugam conuersi sunt. Set vnum ceperunt, cui nomen Radulfus de Fenton', qui missus fuit apud Hunted' ad incarcerandum; et tunc fuit vicecomes Philippus de Staunton'. Super hoc inquisicio facta fuit sub Sappel' die[8] Martis proxima post clausum Pasche coram Willelmo[9] de Norhampton', tunc balliuo foreste, scilicet per quatuor villatas, scilicet, Magnam Stiuecl', Riptonam Abbatis, Riptonam Regis, Herford'.

Magna Stiuecl' dicit quod Radulfus de Fenton', Osebertus Marescallus, Geruasius Cocus, homines Geremie[10] de Kaxton', venerunt

[1] See p. 23 above.
[2] 22 June 1248.
[3] See p. 24 above.
[4] 27 June 1249.
[5] 6 July 1249.
[6] See p. 17 above.
[7] Sunday, 28 March 1249.
[8] 13 April 1249.
[9] See p. 31, note 6.
[10] Jeremiah of Caxton was one of the king's justices.

It happened in the same year on the Monday [2] next before the feast of St. John the Baptist, that a certain Geoffrey the son of Stephen Swift of Sibthorpe was found in Weybridge with a bow and five arrows; and he acknowledged that he had killed two fawns, and said that Roger the son of Philip of Alconbury had them. And the foresters went to the house of the aforesaid Philip and found those fawns. And the aforesaid Geoffrey and Roger were taken to the gaol of Huntingdon. And because the gaol was broken they were taken to Hartford. And the aforesaid Philip was delivered on bail to the township of Alconbury.

It happened on the Sunday [4] next after the feast of St. John the Baptist in the thirty-third year at daybreak, that when the foresters of Weybridge and Sapley made watch at Weybridge they came upon two greyhounds, which followed a beast. And afterwards they went into the open field, and found Stephen Foot and a certain Geoffrey the son of Osbert, reapers. And the foresters took the two greyhounds and the aforesaid Stephen and Geoffrey and brought them to Alconbury to await the coming of the verderers. And in the meantime the aforesaid Geoffrey escaped from the custody of the foresters. And the aforesaid Stephen was brought to the prison at Hartford. The chattels of the aforesaid Stephen were a cow, an ox, and a bullock. The price of the chattels was eight shillings. The aforesaid Geoffrey had no chattels. Upon this an inquisition was made on the Tuesday [5] next before the feast [of the Translation] of St. Thomas the Martyr by Alconbury, Brampton, Woolley, Buckworth. All are agreed, and say that they suspect no one of the aforesaid matter; nor do they know whence the greyhounds came.

It happened on Palm Sunday [7] in the same year at vespers that when the foresters of Sapley were watching at Sapley, they met eight malefactors with greyhounds. And when the foresters saw them, they turned and fled. But they took one of them, Ralph of Fenton by name, who was sent to Huntingdon to be imprisoned; and Philip of Stanton was then sheriff. Upon this an inquisition was made at Sapley on the Tuesday [8] next after the close of Easter before William of Northampton, then bailiff of the forest, that is to say, by four townships, to wit, Great Stukeley, Abbots Ripton, King's Ripton, and Hartford.

Great Stukeley says that Ralph of Fenton, Osbert the marshall, and Gervais the cook, men of Jeremiah of Caxton, came on Palm

die Dominica Palmarum ad vesperas cum leporariis sub Sappell ad malefaciendum de venacione domini regis, et neminem habent suspectum preter hos tres malefactores; et hos nisi per indiccionem predicti Radulfi de Fenton'.

Alie villate dicunt idem.

[1] Inquisicio facta in campo de Iakel' die [2] Animarum anno regni regis Henrici filii Iohannis regis tricesimo quinto de capcione cuiusdam dami per forestarios et viridarios et quatuor villatas scilicet Iakel', Folkeswrth', Stilton', et Morburn' et Caudecot'.

Iakel', iurata, dixit quod dominus H. de Engayne fugauit cum canibus suis ad vulpem in campo comitis Cornub' apud Hold [3] die [4] Lune proxima ante festum sancte Fidis anno tricesimo quarto; et die Martis proxima sequenti venit quidam damus quasi pecus perterita de Holm transiens campum de Stilton' versus campum de Iakel'. Et tres homines equites sequti fuerunt dictum damum. Et venit quidam Michael de Depinham, garcio Iohannis de Depinham seruientis de Wodeston', et percussit dictum damum cum quadam hachia ad Pyc sicut voluit transisse quandam foueam et eum occidit. Et venerunt dicti tres homines, qui sequti fuerunt, abstulerunt ei damum et redierunt versus Holm, set nescit qui illi fuerunt nec vnde venerunt.

Folkeswrth', iurata, dicit idem quod Iakel'.

Stilton' dicit idem quod dixit coram G.[5] de Langel', iusticiario foreste, apud Hunted'.

Caldecot' et Morbur,' iurate, dicunt quod nichil inde sciunt.

Michael de Depinh' qui occidit damum captus fuit et commissus Willelmo de Elinton', balliuo abbatis de Thorn' de hundredo de Normancros, ad ponendum in prisonam.

Iohannes de Depeham inuenit plegios de respondendo coram iusticiariis quare recepit dictum Michaelem postquam occidit damum, scilicet, Philippum de Orreby in Sautr', Hugonem le Despens' de eadem, Galfridum de Beumes, Iohannem filium Iohannis de Lytlebiry de Ouerton', Simonem Clifard de Stilton', Iohannem filium Paulini de Sautre.

Quidam Ricardus de Stilton' cognouit quod stetit super quoddam tassum turbe in Stilton' et vidit duos homines equites et duos homines pedites capere dictum damum cum duobus canibus albis. Et quia non leuauit vthesium attachiatus fuit; et inuenit plegios respondendi

[1] See pp. 11, 12 above.

[2] Wednesday, 2 November 1250.

[3] Hold is probably a clerical error for Holm.

[4] 3 October 1250.

[5] In this case there seems to have been some preliminary inquisition before Geoffrey of Langley, who was warden of the forest at this time. See p. 37, note 2.

Sunday in the evening with greyhounds to Sapley to do evil to the venison of the lord king; and that they suspect no one except those three malefactors; and this only on the information of the aforesaid Ralph of Fenton.

The other townships say the same.

An inquisition concerning the taking of a certain buck was made in the open field of Yaxley on All Souls' day [2] in the thirty-fifth year of the reign of king Henry the son of king John by the foresters and verderers and four townships, to wit Yaxley, Folksworth, Stilton and Morborne and Caldecot.

Yaxley is sworn and says that Sir Henry de Engayne was fox-hunting with his own dogs in the open field of the Earl of Cornwall at Hold on the Monday [4] next before the feast of St. Faith in the thirty-fourth year; and on the Tuesday next following a certain buck, as a beast frightened out of Holm, came across the open field of Stilton, towards the open field of Yaxley. And three men on horseback followed the said buck. And a certain Michael of Debenham, the page of John of Debenham the sergeant of Woodstone, came and struck the said buck with a certain pickaxe, as it was about to cross a certain ditch, and killed it. And the said three men, who followed, came and took the buck from him and returned towards Holm; but the township did not know who they were, nor whence they came.

Folksworth is sworn, and says the same as Yaxley.

Stilton says the same as it said before Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest, at Huntingdon.

Caldecot and Morborne are sworn, and say that they know nothing thereof.

Michael of Debenham who killed the buck was taken and sent to William of Ellington, the abbot of Thorney's bailiff of the hundred of Normancross, to be put in prison.

John of Debenham found pledges of answering before the justices, as to why he harboured the said Michael after he killed the buck, to wit, Philip of Orreby in Sawtry, Hugh the spenser of the same town, Geoffrey de Beumes, John the son of John of Littlebury of Orton, Simon Clifard of Stilton and John the son of Paul of Sawtry.

A certain Richard of Stilton acknowledged that he stood upon a certain stack of turf in Stilton and saw two men on horseback and two on foot take the said buck with two white dogs. And because he did not raise the hue, he was attached, and found pledges

coram iusticiariis, scilicet, Oliuerum de Upton', Rogerum filium Basilii de Stilton', Thomam de Stilton', Iohannem de Salue in eadem, Iohannem le Franchom de eadem et Robertum de Stilton'.

Omnes villate, iurate, dicunt quod nullam suspicionem habent de capcione dami versus Radulfum personam de Syresham, nec versus Rogerum personam de Glatton' sicut factum fuit intelligi domino G.[1] de Langel', iusticiario foreste; nec per eos captus fuit nec per aliquem qui cum eis sit.

[2] Accidit die [3] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Petri ad Vincula anno eodem quod Willelmus Ruffus et Galfridus de Pylketon', forestarii pedites de Wauberge, venerunt contra mediam noctem sub Wauberge ad insidiandam balliuam suam, ita quod ad N. . . . versus Alcunbiry obuiauerunt cuidam leporario ruffo thesanti vnam damam. Et ipsi exclamauerunt dictum leporarium et eum ceperunt. Postea venerunt duodecim homines sequentes leporarium, quorum vnus tulit vnam hachiam in manu sua, et alius quemdam longum baculum, et alii decem arcus et sagittas; et duxerunt tres leporarios in lesso, quorum vnus fuit albus, alter techellatus albedine et nigredine, et tercius nescierunt cuius coloris fuit. Et forestarii clamauerunt eos et ipsi tractauerunt ad forestarios sex sagittas, tres barbatas et tres genderatas. Et forestarii tractauerunt ad eos, et ipsi intrauerunt boscum. Et propter spissitudinem bosci et obscuritatem noctis forestarii nescierunt quo deuenerunt.

Postea die [4] Dominica proxima sequenti, conuocatis forestariis, viridariis et quatuor villatis propinquioribus, scilicet, Alcunbiry Weston', Magna Stiuecl' et Parua Stiuecl', Elinton' Sibetorp ad inquirendum qui homines illi fuerunt, et vnde venerunt et quo redierunt, et cuius leporarii illi fuerunt, et si aliquis nouit illum leporarium ruffum, qui captus fuit. Forestarii uero, iurati, dicunt per sacramentum suum quod cognouerunt vnum ex illis malefactoribus, qui uocatur Geruasius de Dene in comitatu Bed', quondam cocus Ieremie [5] de Caxton', et nunc est cum domino Iohanne [6] de Crachel'; et dicunt quod solitus est malefacere in foresta inrotulatus in rotulo viridariorum; de aliis autem nichil sciunt, set dicunt quod quidam eorum fuerunt armati, set nescierunt quot.

Alcunbir' Weston', Magna Stiuecl', Parua Stiuecl', Elinton' Sibetorp, iurate, nichil inde sciunt.

[1] See p. 37, note 2.
[2] See pp. 12, 13 above.
[3] 2 August 1251.
[4] 6 August 1251.
[5] See p. 75, note 10.
[6] According to Mathew Paris, John of Crakehall was appointed Treasurer about 18 October, 1258. See *Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, vol. v. p. 719.

of answering before the justices, to wit, Oliver of Upton, Roger the son of Basil of Stilton, Thomas of Stilton, John of Sallowe of the same town, John the Freeman of the same town and Robert of Stilton.

All the townships are sworn and say that they have no suspicion concerning the taking of the buck against Ralph the parson of Syresham, nor against Roger the parson of Glatton, as Sir Geoffrey of Langley the justice of the forest was given to understand, nor was the buck taken by them nor by any person who is with them.

It happened on the Wednesday [3] next after the feast of St. Peter's Chains in the same year that William le Rus and Geoffrey of Pilton, walking foresters of Weybridge, were going towards midnight to Weybridge to lie in watch over their bailiwick, so that at N. towards Alconbury they met a certain red greyhound worrying a doe. And they called the said greyhound and took it. Afterwards twelve men came following the greyhound, one of whom carried an axe in his hand, and another a certain long stick, and the others ten bows and arrows, And they led three greyhounds in a leash, of which one was white. and another ticked with white and black; and of what colour the third was they knew not. And the foresters called the men, who shot six arrows at the foresters, three barbed and three 'genderated.' And the foresters shot at the men who entered the wood. And on account of the thickness of the wood and the darkness of the night the foresters knew not what became of them.

Afterwards on the Sunday [4] next following the foresters, verderers, and four neighbouring townships, to wit, Alconbury Weston, Great Stukeley and Little Stukeley, and Ellington Sibthorp assembled to inquire who those men were, and whence they came and whither they returned, and whose those greyhounds were, and if any one knew that red greyhound, which was taken. And the foresters are sworn and say upon their oath that they recognised one of those malefactors who is called Gervais of Dene in the county of Bedford, formerly the cook of Jeremiah of Caxton, and who is now with Sir John of Crakehall. And they say that he is wont to do evil in the forest and is enrolled in the verderers' roll. But of the others they know nothing; but they say that some of them were armed, but how many they knew not.

Alconbury Weston, Great Stukeley, Little Stukeley and Ellington Sibthorp are sworn and say that they know nothing thereof.

Tres sagitte barbate et tres genderate commisse fuerunt Ricardo le Porter, viridario, de Weston' tenende coram iusticiariis.

Postea die [1] Mercurii in crastina Assumpcionis beate Marie contra horam primam venerunt Ricardus de Rudham [2] et Willelmus le Rus, Galfridus de Pilketon' et Willelmus de Graffham forestarii pedites in curia grangiarum prioratus de Hunted', et obuiauerunt dicto Geruasio de Dene equitanti super harnesium domini Iohannis de Crackale; et ceperunt eum et conuocauerunt tres villatas propinquiores scilicet Herf', Magnam Stiuecl', Riptonam Regis ad harnesium custodiendum; et posuerunt dictum Geruasium in prisonam de Hunted'; tunc vicecomes dominus H. de Coleuil'. Post nonam uero venerunt ad forestarios Walterus capellanus de Hunted' et alii capellani de eadem, et Willelmus de Leycestr', balliuus domini episcopi Linc', cum libro et candela uolentes excomunicare omnes qui manum inposuerunt in dictum Geruasium; et pecierunt eum vt clericum et seruientem domini episcopi; et preceperunt forestariis deliberare eum de prisona. Forestarii uero dixerunt quod non habuerunt potestatem deliberandi ipsum ex quo fuit inprisonatus. Et ipsi iuerunt ad prisonam et in presencia forestariorum ceperunt dictum Geruasium de prisona vt clericum, et deposuerunt tenam suam, et habuit coronam de nouo rasam vnde forestarii habuerunt suspicionem quod rasa fuit eodem die in prisona. Dictus uero Geruasius iuit ad hernesium suum et cepit illud et adiuit domum suam.[3]

[4] Accidit die [5] Veneris proxima ante festum sancti Andree anno tricesimo sexto quod dominus R. de Clar' comes Glouc' iacuit in villa sancti [Neti] in itinere suo versus Eboracum. Die Sabbati mane misit magistrum cocum suum et Willelmum marescallum suum et Walterum clericum de camera sua versus Stamford' ad hospicium suum capiendum; qui transierunt sub Wauberge et ceperunt vnam damam cum tribus leporariis, quos duxerunt. Ricardus de Rudham, tunc forestarius eques, monstrauit hoc factum domino comiti qui predictos homines bene aduocauit et factum eorum warantizauit.

[6] Accidit die [7] Sabbati proxima ante Anunciacionem beate Marie anno tricesimo septimo quod Ricardus de Rudham et Willelmus de Cattewrthe et alii forestarii venerunt sub Sappel' infra noctem, ita

[1] 16 August 1251.

[2] The MS. has Rudham; but the same place is twice called Ludham in subsequent entries.

[3] MS. 'suum.'

[4] See p. 13, above.

[5] 24 November 1251.

[6] See p. 13 above.

[7] 22 March 125$\frac{2}{3}$.

The three barbed arrows and the three 'genderated' arrows were entrusted to Richard le Porter, the verderer, of Weston, to be produced before the justices.

Afterwards on Wednesday[1] the morrow of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary towards the first hour Richard of Ludham and William le Rus, Geoffrey of Pilketon, and William of Grafham, the walking foresters, came to the court of the granges of the priory of Huntingdon and met the said Gervais of Dene riding upon the harness of Sir John of Crakehall. And they took him and assembled three neighbouring townships, to wit, Hartford, Great Stukeley, King's Ripton to guard the harness; and they put the said Gervais in Huntingdon prison, the sheriff being then Sir Henry de Colleville. But after noon there came to the foresters Walter the chaplain of Huntingdon, and other chaplains of the same town, and William of Leicester, the bailiff of the lord bishop of Lincoln, with a book and a candle, intending to excommunicate all those who laid hands on the said Gervais. And they demanded him as a clerk and a servant of the lord bishop and ordered the foresters to deliver him from prison. But the foresters said that they had no power to deliver him from the time he was imprisoned. And they went to the prison and in the presence of the foresters took the said Gervais from prison as a clerk. And they took off his cap and he had the crown of his head freshly shaven, whence the foresters suspected that it was shaved that day in prison. And the said Gervais went to his harness, and took it and went home.

It happened on the Friday[5] next before the feast of St. Andrew in the thirty-sixth year that Sir Richard of Clare, earl of Gloucester, slept in the town of St. Neots on his journey to York. On the Saturday morning he sent his master-cook and William his marshal and Walter the clerk of his chamber to Stamford to take his lodgings. They passed through Weybridge, and with three greyhounds, which they led, took a doe. Richard of Ludham, then a riding forester, reported this deed to the lord earl who well avowed the aforesaid men and warranted their deed.

It happened on the Saturday[7] next before the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-seventh year that Richard of Ludham and William of Catworth and other foresters came to Sapley in the

quod viderunt duos leporarios ruffos currentes. Et exclamauerunt leporarios et eos ceperunt. Et expectauerunt clam insidiantes si aliquis sequeretur dictos leporarios et neminem viderunt. Postea die Lune proxima sequenti, conuocatis forestariis, viridariis et quatuor villatis propinquioribus, scilicet, Magna Stiuecl', Riptona Abbatis, Herford', Riptona Regis ad inquirendum cuius predicti leporarii fuerunt, et vnde venerunt, et quis eos duxit in forestam domini regis ad malefaciendum.

Predicte villate dixerunt quod nichil inde sciuerunt.

[1] Septem clerici et vnus capellanus, vt dixerunt, capti fuerunt per forestarios et patriam in Stangate pro suspicione roberie die[2] Lune proxima ante Inuencionem sancte Crucis anno eodem et commissi fuerunt Simoni[3] de Houton', vicecomiti de Hunted' et Cant', coram iusticiario ad ponendum in prisonam. Quinque arcus de yf cum cordis, quos tulerunt, et tres walecthis[4] et vnum bosun traditi fuerunt Simoni de Copmanford'.

XII. (a).[5]

[QUEDAM INQUISICIONES DE UENACIONE IN FORESTA DE ROCKINGHAM TEMPORE WILLELMI DE NORHAMTON'.]

Balliua de Stanerne.

[6] Accidit die[7] Mercurii in crastino apostolorum Philippi et Iacobi anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo quod, cum Willelmus de Norhampt' et Rogerus de Tyngewyc de placitis de Stanerne uersus placita de Salcet' iter arripuissent, datum fuit intelligi prenominatis W. et R., quod bersatores fuerunt in landa de Banifeld cum leporariis ad malefaciendum de venacione domini regis. Et cum predicti W. et R. ad landam peruenissent et ibidem insidiando expectassent, Iacobus de Turleber', forestarius eiusdem balliue, et Matheus frater eius, forestarius in parco de Bricstok', uenerunt cum forestariis peditibus ad mandatum predicti W. de Norhampt'; et viderunt quinque

[1] See p. 14 above.
[2] 28 April 1253.
[3] See p. 12, note 14.
[4] The reading of this word is doubtful. The MS. is much worn here.
[5] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 63. These are some of the inquisitions upon which the rolls of the eyre of June 1255 were based. See pp. 27 to 38.
[6] See p. 28.
[7] 2 May 1246.

night and saw two red greyhounds running. And they called the greyhounds and took them. And they waited, lying in ambush to see if anyone followed the said greyhounds, and they saw nobody. Afterwards on the Monday next following, the foresters, verderers, and four neighbouring townships, to wit, Great Stukeley, Abbots Ripton, Hartford and King's Ripton, being assembled to make inquiry as to whose the aforesaid greyhounds were, and whence they came, and who brought them into the king's forest to do evil, the aforesaid townships said that they knew nothing thereof.

Seven clerks and a chaplain, as they said, were taken by the foresters and country in Stangate on suspicion of robbery on the Monday [2] next before the Invention of the Holy Cross in the same year; and they were committed to Simon of Houghton, the sheriff of Huntingdon and Cambridge, in the presence of the justice to be imprisoned. The five bows of yew with strings, which they carried, and three Welsh arrows and a bolt were delivered to Simon of Coppingford.

XII. (a).

CERTAIN INQUISITIONS CONCERNING THE VENISON IN THE FOREST OF ROCKINGHAM IN THE TIME OF WILLIAM OF NORTHAMPTON.

Bailiwick of Stanion.

It happened on Wednesday [7] the morrow of the apostles Philip and James in the thirtieth year of the reign of king Henry that when William of Northampton and Roger of Tingewick were on their way from the pleas of Stanion to the pleas of Salcey, the before-named William and Roger were given to understand that poachers were in the lawn of Beanfield with greyhounds for the purpose of doing evil to the venison of the lord king. And when the aforesaid William and Roger had reached the lawn and were waiting there in ambush, James of Thurlbear, forester of the same bailiwick, and Mathew, his brother, forester in the park of Brigstock, came with the walking foresters on the order sent by the aforesaid William of Northampton.

leporarios, quorum vnus erat albus, alius niger, tercius fauus, quartus niger coueratus fugantes bestias, quos dictus W. et R. ceperunt. Quintus, uero, leporarius teyngre euasit. Et cum predicti sub foresta redierunt a capcione leporariorum insidiando viderunt quinque bersatores in dominico domini regis de Wydehawe, vnum cum balista, et quatuor cum arcubus et sagittis stantes ad fusta sua. Quos cum forestarii percepissent, exclamauerunt eos et eos prosecuti fuerunt. Et predicti malefactores ad fusta sua stantes turnauerunt in defensum et in forestarios sagittas suas direxerunt, ita quod wlnerauerunt Matheum forestarium de parco de Bricstok' cum duabus sagittis waliscis, scilicet cum vna sagitta sub mamilla sinistra ad profunditatem vnius palme de belongo et cum alia sagitta in brachio sinistro ad profunditatem duorum digitatuum, ita quod de uita dicti Mathei desperabatur. Et forestarii predictos malefactores tam uiriliter prosecuti fuerunt, quod malefactores in fugam conuersi sunt in spissitudine bosci. Et forestarii propter noctis obscuritatem amplius eos prosequi non potuerunt. Et super hec facta fuit inquisicio apud Banifeld coram Willelmo [1] de Norhampt', tunc balliuo foreste, et forestariis et viridariis patrie die [2] inuencionis sancte Crucis anno eodem per quatuor uillatas propinquiores lande Banifeld, videlicet, per Stoke, Carelton', Magnam Acle, Coreby.

Stoke venit et, iurata, dicit quod nichil inde scit,[3] tantummodo quod forestarii prosecuti fuerunt malefactores cum hy et cry usque ad noctis obscuritatem, et quod vnus forestarius wlneratus fuit. Et nescit cuius fuerunt leporarii.

Carelton' uenit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Coreby uenit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Magna [Acle][4] uenit et, iurata, dicit quod uidit quatuor homines et vnum leporarium teyngre eos sequentes, scilicet, vnum cum balista et tres cum arcubus et sagittis, et exclamauit eos, et secuta est eos cum forestariis usque ad noctis obscuritatem ita quod propter noctis obscuritatem et bosci spissitudinem nesciit[5] quo deuenerunt.

Plegii uillate de Stok' coram iusticiariis :—Thomas prepositus, Petrus de Coleuile.

Plegii uillate de Carelton' coram iusticiariis :—Galfridus Wythoud, Walterus Baret.

Plegii uillate de Corby coram iusticiariis :—Norman filius prepositi, Godwynus ad portam Aule.

[1] See p. 31, note 6. Throughout this roll William of Northampton is described as bailiff of the forest and not as steward. He was acting as deputy for the steward or warden.

[2] 3 May 1246.

[3] MS. 'sit.'

[4] This word is omitted in the original.

[5] MS. 'nesciut.'

And they saw five greyhounds, of which one was white, another black, the third fallow, a fourth black covered, hunting beasts, which greyhounds the said William and Roger took. But the fifth greyhound which was tawny escaped. And when the aforesaid William and Roger returned to the forest after taking the greyhounds, they lay in ambush and saw five poachers in the lord king's demesne of Wydehawe, one with a crossbow and four with bows and arrows standing at their trees. And when the foresters perceived them, they hailed and pursued them. And the aforesaid malefactors standing at their trees turned in defence and shot arrows at the foresters so that they wounded Mathew, the forester of the park of Brigstock, with two Welsh arrows, to wit with one arrow under the left breast, to the depth of one hand slantwise, and with the second arrow in the left arm to the depth of two fingers, so that it was despaired of the life of the said Matthew. And the foresters pursued the aforesaid malefactors so vigorously that they turned and fled into the thickness of the wood. And the foresters on account of the darkness of the night could follow them no more. And thereupon an inquisition was made at Beanfield before William of Northampton, then bailiff of the forest, and the foresters and verderers of the country on the day[2] of the Invention of the Holy Cross in the same year by four townships neighbouring on the lawn of Beanfield, to wit, by Stoke, Carlton, Great Oakley, and Corby.

Stoke comes and being sworn says that it knows nothing thereof except only that the foresters attacked the malefactors with hue and cry until the darkness of night came, and that one of the foresters was wounded. And it does not know whose were the greyhounds.

Carlton comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Corby comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Great Oakley comes and, being sworn, says that it saw four men and one tawny greyhound following them, to wit, one with a crossbow and three with bows and arrows, and it hailed them and followed them with the foresters until the darkness of night came, so that on account of the darkness of night and the thickness of the wood it knew not what became of them.

Pledges of the township of Stoke being before the justices:— Thomas the reeve, Peter de Colleville.

Pledges of the township of Carlton being before the justices:— Geoffrey Wythoud, Walter Baret.

Pledges of the township of Corby being before the justices:— Norman the son of the reeve, Godwin atte Hall gate.

Plegii uillate de Magna Acle coram iusticiariis:—Rogerus filius Roberti, Galfridus filius Nicholai.

Sagitte cum quibus Matheus wlneratus fuit, tradite fuerunt domino Roberto Basset et Iohanni Louet, viridariis.

Leporarii missi fuerunt domino R. Passel', tunc iusticiario de foresta.

[1] Inquisicio facta apud Banifeld anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo coram domino Alano de Maydewell', vicecomite de Norhampt', de Matheo forestario interfecto apud Banifeld per omnes uillatas hundredorum de Corby et de Stoke de Rowell' et de Stodfold, et per triginta et quatuor tam milites quam liberos et legales homines patrie quorum nomina sunt subscripta videlicet . . . et per forestarios et viridarios illius balliue, qui dicunt omnes super sacramentum suum, quod nichil inde sciunt nisi tantummodo quod cum Iacobus de Turlebere, frater Mathei occisi, Thomas Borhard, Iohannes filius Yuonis, forestarii domini regis, commedissent die [2] Veneris proxima post clausum Pasche cum abbate de Pipwell' anno eodem, viderunt predicti forestarii in abbacia de Pypwelle tres leporarios, videlicet, vnum teyngre, et vnum fauum, et vnum nigrum coueratum; de quibus duo ex illis leporariis capti fuerunt quando Matheus forestarius occisus fuit, et tercius teyngre qui euasit cum malefactoribus. Et eosdem leporarios aduocauit Symon de Kyueleworthe in abbacia de Pippwell' coram abbate de Pypwell'. Et quia forestarii iurati presentauerunt viridariis, quod idem erant leporarii qui capti fuerunt quando Matheus occisus fuit, quos dictus Simon aduocauit, dictus Symon de Kyueleworthe propter suspiccionem mortis predicte captus fuit et missus apud Norhampt' ad inprisonandum. Et fuit tunc vicecomes Alanus de Maydewell'.

Abbas vero de Pypwell' inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis de foresta pro receptamento [dicti Symonis et] [3] dictorum [4] leporariorum [et aduocauit dictum Simonem et leporarios].[3] Et hec sunt nomina plegiorum suorum . . .[5]

[6] Accidit die [7] sancti Barnabe, apostoli, anno rengni regis [Henrici] [8] tricesimo quod Iacobus de Turlebere, forestarius in parco de Bricstok', uenit in dicto parco circa horam primam et inuenit vnum hominem,

[1] See p. 28.
[2] 20 April 1246.
[3] The words in brackets are interlineated in the original.
[4] This word is written twice in the original, being once interlineated.
[5] Six names.
[6] See p. 29 above.
[7] Monday, 11 June 1246.
[8] This word is omitted in the original.

Pledges of the town of Great Oakley being before the justices:— Roger the son of Robert, Geoffrey the son of Nicholas.

The arrows with which Mathew was wounded were delivered to Sir Robert Basset and John Lovet, verderers.

The greyhounds were sent to Sir Robert Passelewe, then justice of the forest.

An inquisition was made at Benefield in the thirtieth year of the reign of King Henry before Sir Alan of Maidwell, sheriff of Northampton, concerning Mathew the forester, who was killed at Beanfield, by all the townships of the hundreds of Corby, Stoke, Rothwell and Stodfold, and by thirty-four as well knights as free and loyal men of the country, whose names are underwritten, to wit, . . . , and by the foresters and verderers of that bailiwick, who all say upon oath that they know nothing thereof except only that when James of Thurlbear, the brother of Mathew who was killed, Thomas Borhard, John the son of Ives, foresters of the lord king, were eating on the Friday [2] next after the close of Easter in the same year with the abbot of Pipewell, the aforesaid foresters saw in the abbey of Pipewell three greyhounds, to wit, one tawny, one fallow, and one black covered. And two of these greyhounds were taken when Mathew the forester was slain, and the third, the tawny greyhound, escaped with the malefactors. And Simon of Kivelsworthy avowed the same greyhounds in the abbey of Pipewell before the abbot of Pipewell. And because the foresters, on being sworn, presented to the verderers that the greyhounds which were taken when Mathew was killed were the same as those which the said Simon avowed, the said Simon of Kivelsworthy was, on suspicion of the death aforesaid, taken and sent to Northampton to be imprisoned. And Alan of Maidwell was then sheriff.

And the abbot of Pipewell finds pledges of answering before the justices of the forest for harbouring the said Simon and the said greyhounds; and he avowed the said Simon and the greyhounds. And these are the names of his pledges . . .

It happened on the day [7] of St. Barnabas the Apostle, in the thirtieth year of the reign of King Henry, that James of Thurlbear, forester in the park of Brigstock, came into the park of Brigstock

qui uocabatur Iohannes filius Stephani Cut de Slipton', portantem vnum fetonem dame; et dictus Iacobus cepit eum et fecit summonere Ricardum de Audeuincle, viridarium, qui uenit in crastino[1] sancti Barnabe et interogauit dictum Iohannem filium Stephani de societate eiusdem qui nullam se dixit habere societatem. Dictus vero Iohannes filius Stephani Cut missus fuit apud Norhampt' ad inprisonandum. Et fuit tunc vicecomes Alanus de Maydewell'.

Pellis vero predicti fetonis liberata fuit Iohanni Louet, viridario, ut habeat coram iusticiariis de foresta.

Accidit die[2] Veneris proxima ante festum sancti Edwardi regis anno rengni regis tricesimo, quod Thomas filius Rogeri[3] Fulconis de Geytinton' uenit in parco de Bricstok' circa horam meridianam et inuenit vnum ceruum wlneratum et mortuum; et habuit vnam plagam in sinistra costa, et aliam plagam in sinistra parte collis. Et venit dictus Thomas et obuiauit forestariis et intimauit eis que uiderat de ceruo mortuo. Et facta fuit inquisicio in parco predicto die[4] Sabbati proxima ante festum sancti Edwardi per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Geytinton', Bricstoke, Stanerne, Bouhton'.

Geytinton' venit et, iurata, dicit quod uiderunt dictum ceruum mortuum, et quemdam alium ceruum per duos dies pugnantes adinuicem, et quod ceruus occidit alium, et neminem habuit in suspectum nisi hoc quod accidit ex infortunio.

Bricstok' non uenit, ideo inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis respondendi. Nomina plegiorum videlicet. . .[5]

Caro autem tributa fuit pauperibus. Et cutis tradita fuit domino Roberto Basset tunc viridario.

[6]Accidit die[7] Veneris proxima post festum sancti Edwardi anno tricesimo rengni regis Henrici quod Walterus homo Hugonis[8] de Goldingham de Magna Acle uenerunt[9] summo mane in pratis de Acle et uiderunt[9] ibi vnam bissam amentem et aliquando titubantem et aliquando cadentem. Et cum hec uiderant,[9] intimauerunt forestariis; et forestarii miserunt propter uiridarios; et venerunt uiridarii, et

[1] Tuesday, 12 June 1246.
[2] 15 June 1246.
[3] This word is interlineated in the original.
[4] 16 June 1246.
[5] Four names.
[6] See p. 29 above.
[7] 21 June 1246.
[8] The words 'Hugonis de Goldingham' are interlineated in the roll.
[9] This word is written in the plural in the original.

about the first hour, and found a man, who was called John the son of Stephen Cut of Slipton, carrying a doe's fawn. And the said James took him, and caused Richard of Aldwinkle, the verderer, to be summoned. And he came on the morrow [1] of St. Barnabas, and questioned the said John the son of Stephen about his accomplices; and he said that he had no accomplices. And the said John the son of Stephen Cut was sent to Northampton to be imprisoned. And the sheriff was then Alan of Maidwell.

And the skin of the aforesaid fawn was delivered to John Lovet, verderer, to have before the justices of the forest.

It happened on the Friday [2] next before the feast of St. Edward the king, in the thirtieth year, that Thomas the son of Roger Fulk of Geddington came into the park of Brigstock about midday, and found a hart wounded and dead, and it had one wound in the left side and another on the left part of the neck. And the said Thomas came and met the foresters, and made known to them what he had seen of the dead hart. And an inquisition was made in the park aforesaid on the Saturday [4] next before the feast of St. Edward by four neighbouring townships, to wit by Geddington, Brigstock, Stanion, Boughton.

Geddington comes, and being sworn, says that they saw the said hart, which is dead, and another hart fighting for two days with one another, and that one hart killed the other; and that it suspects nobody, except this, that it happened accidentally. Brigstock does not come, therefore it finds pledges of making answer before the justices. Names of the pledges, to wit . . .

And the flesh was given to the poor. And the skin was delivered to Sir Robert Basset, then a verderer.

It happened on the Friday [7] next after the feast of St. Edward in the thirtieth year of the reign of king Henry that Walter, the man of Hugh of Goldingham, of Great Oakley, came at daybreak into the meadows of Oakley and saw there a mad hind, sometimes stumbling and sometimes falling. And when he saw this he sent word to the foresters; and the foresters sent for the verderers. And the verderers

uiderunt dictam bissam amentem. Et viridarii tradiderunt dictam bissam uiuam uillate de Magna Acle usque in crastinum. Dicta uero bissa eadem nocte moriebatur. Et facta fuit inquisicio apud pratum de Acle die Sabbati sequenti coram viridariis et forestariis per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Magnam Acle, Paruam Acle, Neuton', Corby.

Magna Acle uenit et, iurata, dicit quod de morte dicte bisse nichil scit,[1] nisi quod ex infirmitate moriebatur.

Parua Acle uenit et dicit idem.

Neuton' uenit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Corby uenit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Caro autem liberata fuit pauperibus de Rokingham. Cutis liberata fuit Iohanni Louet custodienda usque aduentum iusticiariorum.

[2] Accidit die [3] Iouis proxima ante festum Margarete anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo quod, cum Willelmus forestarius pedes in parco de Bricstoke intrasset balliuam suam de parco, inuenit Hugonem Swartgar, messorem uillate de Bricstok', ducentem duos mastinos contra defensum forestariorum, scilicet, vnum album et alium ruffum. Quidam uero homo de Bricstok' qui uocabatur Henricus Tuke ibat cum messore, quos, cum uidisset, dictus W. uoluit eos atachiare propter canes, quos ducebant tam sero sub parco domini regis. Et noluerunt pati eos atachiare. Dictus uero Willelmus forestarius intrauit uillam de Bricstoke insidiando, et iterum rediit ad locum ubi predictos prius uiderat, et uidit eos iterum in eodem loco. Cum autem predictus Hugo et predictus Henricus Tucke uiderunt forestarium venientem uersus eos statim in fugam conuersi sunt; et eos capere non potuit. Et dictus Willelmus forestarius intrauit uillam de Bricstok', et peciit Willelmum clericum abbatis de Cyrencestre et Henricum prepositum de Bricstok' ut irent cum eo et uiderent, quod ibi fecerunt. Et euntes cum eo inuenerunt in dicto loco quo prius eos uiderat quinque laqueos de serico equino, quos dictus Hugo et Henricus Tucke illuc posuerunt ad fetones vel ad lepores capiendos. Dictus Willelmus forestarius omnia que uiderat uiridariis intimauit. Et coram viridariis positi sunt per plegios usque aduentum iusticiariorum de foresta.

Hec sunt nomina plegiorum Hugonis Swartgar:—Galfridus Swartgar, Hugo filius Godyine, Gilbertus ad Stangnum, Petrus filius Ade, Henricus filius Ricardi, Henricus filius Geruasii.

[1] MS. 'sit.' [2] See p. 29. [3] 19 July 1246.

came, and saw the said mad hind. And the verderers delivered the said hind, while alive, to the township of Great Oakley till the morrow. But the said hind died the same night. And an inquisition was made at the meadow of Oakley on the Saturday following before the verderers and foresters by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Great Oakley, Little Oakley, Newton, Corby.

Great Oakley comes and, being sworn, says that it knows nothing of the death of the said hind, except that it died of sickness.

Little Oakley comes and says the same.

Newton comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Corby comes and, being sworn, says the same.

The flesh was delivered to the poor of Rockingham. The skin was delivered to John Lovet, to be kept till the coming of the justices.

It happened on the Thursday[3] next before the feast of Saint Margaret, in the thirtieth year of the reign of king Henry, that, when William, the walking forester in the park of Brigstock, entered his bailiwick of the park, he found Hugh Swartgar, the reaper of the town of Brigstock, leading two mastiffs—to wit, one white and the other red—against the prohibition of the foresters. And a certain man of Brigstock, who was called Henry Tuke, went with the reaper. And when he saw them, the said William wished to attach them, on account of the dogs which they led so late in the park of the lord king. And they refused to allow him to attach them. And the said William the forester went into the town of Brigstock stealthily, and again returned to the place where he had seen them before; and he saw them a second time in the same place. But when the aforesaid Hugh and the aforesaid Henry Tuke saw the forester coming towards them, they forthwith turned and fled, and he could not take them. And the said William the forester went into the town of Brigstock and sought for William, the clerk of the abbot of Cirencester, and Henry the reeve of Brigstock, so that they might come with him and see what the men did there. And they went with him, and found in the same place where he had seen them before five snares of horse hair, which the said Hugh and Henry Tuke had placed there for taking fawns or hares. The said William the forester informed the verderers of all that he had seen. And in the presence of the verderers the men were put by pledges until the coming of the justices of the forest.

These are the names of the pledges of Hugh Swartgar:—Geoffrey Swartgar, Hugh the son of Godwin, Gilbert atte Pool, Peter the son of Adam, Henry the son of Richard, Henry the son of Gervais.

Hec sunt nomina plegiorum[1] Henrici Tucke:—Iohannes de Lurtebroc, Matheus Croyle, Ricardus filius Roberti, Henricus de Lurtebroc, Robertus de Sutburgo, Henricus prepositus de Bricstok'.

Memorandum quod quinque laquei predicti traditi fuerunt Hugoni filio Godyene et Gilberto de Hungre ad custodiendum usque aduentum iusticiariorum de foresta.

[2] Anno tricesimo primo. Accidit die[3] Dominica proxima post Epiphaniam anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo primo quod cum Mauricius de Meht qui dicebat se esse cum domino R. Passel', transsisset mane cum duobus equis per uillam de Sutburgo uidit tres homines portantes vnum saccum. Et cum uidisset illos habuit illos suspectos, et sequebatur eos usque uillam de Sutburgo cum arcu suo extento. Cum autem predicti tres homines uiderunt eum illos sequentem abiecerunt saccum et fugerunt. Dictus vero Mauricius de Meht cepit saccum et inuenit in sacco vnam damam excoriatam et laqueum cum quo bestia capta fuit. Et cum hoc fecisset iuit ad ecclesiam de Sutburgo, et intimauit toti uillate, que acciderant. Et cum hoc fecisset rediit iterum ad saccum et coreum dame asportauit. Dicta vero uillata de Sutburg' misit propter uiridarios et forestarios, qui uenerunt et inuenerunt omnia sicut predicta sunt. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio apud Sutburgum die Lune proxima sequenti coram uiridariis et forestariis patrie per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, scilicet, per Sutburg', Lufwyc', Bricstok', Liuedene.

Sutburg' venit et, iurata, dicit quod Radulfus filius Mabille[4] de Sutburg' fuit vnus eorum qui fugerunt, et tradidit illam venacionem Willelmo filio Henrici de Benifeld. Tercius uero fuit Robertus de Grafton', qui per breue tempus ante fuit cum Angnete Cornet, qui fugit et nondum inuentus est. Set dicta Angnes Cornet inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis de foresta pro dicto Roberto, scilicet, Hugonem filium Rogeri et Petrum filium Rogeri. Predicti uero Radulfus filius Mabille et Willelmus filius Henrici capti fuerunt et missi apud Norhampt' ad inprisonandum, et traditi fuerunt domino Alano de Maydewell' tunc vicecomiti Norhampt'.

Caro dame data fuit leprosis de Trapeston'.

Laqueus uero cum quo dicta dama capta fuit tradebatur Roberto filio Luce de Liueden' et Radulfo filio Quenild' de eadem custodiendus usque in aduentum iusticiariorum de foresta.

[1] This word is omitted in the roll.

[2] See p. 29.

[3] 13 January 124$\frac{6}{7}$.

[4] MS. 'Mibille.'

These are the names of the pledges of Henry Tuke :—John of Lortebrook, Mathew Croyle, Richard the son of Robert, Henry of Lortebrook, Robert of Sudborough and Henry the reeve of Brigstock.

Be it remembered that the aforesaid five snares were delivered to Hugh the son of Godwin and Gilbert of Hungry to keep until the coming of the justices of the forest.

In the thirty-first year. It happened on the Sunday[3] next after the Epiphany, in the thirty-first year of the reign of king Henry, that when Maurice de Meht, who said that he was with Sir Robert Passelewe, passed in the morning with two horses through the town of Sudborough, he saw three men carrying a sack. And when he saw them he suspected them and followed them as far as the town of Sudborough with his bow stretched. And when the aforesaid three men saw him following them they threw away the sack and fled. And the said Maurice de Meht took the sack, and found in it a doe, which had been flayed, and a snare, with which the beast was taken. And when he had done this he went to the church of Sudborough, and made known to the whole township what had happened. And when he had done this he returned again to the sack, and carried away the skin of the doe. And the township of Sudborough sent after the verderers and foresters, who came and found all the things, just as aforesaid. And upon this an inquisition was made at Sudborough on the Monday next following before the verderers and foresters of the country by the four neighbouring townships, to wit, Sudborough, Lowick, Brigstock, Lyveden.

Sudborough comes and, being sworn, says that Ralph the son of Mabel of Sudborough was one of those men who fled, and he delivered that venison to William the son of Henry of Benefield. And the third was Robert of Grafton, who a short time before was with Agnes Cornet; and he fled, and is not yet found. But the said Agnes Cornet finds pledges on behalf of the said Robert of his being before the justices of the forest, to wit Hugh the son of Roger, and Peter the son of Roger. And the aforesaid Ralph the son of Mabel and William the son of Henry were taken and sent to Northampton to be imprisoned; and they were delivered to Sir Alan of Maidwell, then the sheriff of Northampton.

The flesh of the doe was given to the lepers of Thrapston.

And the snare with which the said doe was taken was delivered to Robert the son of Luke of Lyveden, and Ralph the son of Quenyl of the same town, to keep until the coming of the justices of the forest.

Willata de Sutburg' inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis de foresta, quia paciebatur Mauricium de Meht coreum dame asportare.

Catalla Radulfi filii Mabille capta fuerunt in manum domini regis et apreciata per uiridarios et forestarios pro nouem solidis, et tradita fuerunt in balia Thome de Grafton' manenti in Sutburg'.

Robertus de Grafton', fugitiuus, et Willelmus filius Henrici nulla habuerunt catalla.

Mauricius de Meht non fuit captus quia dixit se esse cum domino Roberto Passel', tunc iusticiario foreste.

[1]Accidit die[2] Lune proxima ante festum sancti Mathie apostoli anno tricesimo primo contra uesperas quod Simon Abbas et Willelmus Scoticus socius eius, forestarii pedites in parco de Bricstoke, uenerunt inter boscum Radulfi de sancto Sampsone[3] et parcum de Bricstok' et obuiauerunt Henricum filium Geruasii Piscatoris de Yslop et interogauerunt eum quis esset, qui dixit se esse cum domino Henrico de Drayton', milite. Prenominati uero forestarii miserunt propter[4] uiridarios patrie qui uenerunt et interogauerunt eum de societate eiusdem. Et dictus Henricus indictauit Robertum filium Quenild de receptamento et Radulfum filium Roberti Quenild de societate et Willelmum de Drayton' filium domini Henrici de Drayton' de societate. Et pro suspeccione eadem[5] scrutauerunt viridarii et forestarii domum Roberti filii Quenild et inuenerunt in ea vnam fleckam sanguinolentam fractam. Idem Henricus filius Geruasii de Yslep inuenit plegios de essendo coram iusticiariis de foresta. . . .[6]

Robertus filius Quenild inuenit plegios pro receptamento Radulfi filii sui, scilicet . . .[7]

Radulfus filius Roberti filii Quenild inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis, scilicet . . .[7]

Willelmus filius domini Henrici de Drayton' inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis pro eodem, scilicet . . .[8]

Memorandum quod flecka inuenta in domo Roberti filii Quenild liberata fuit domino R. Basset viridario.

Isti sunt plegii Roberti filii Willelmi de Lufwyc coram iusticiariis pro suspeccione . . .[6]

[1] See p. 30 above.
[2] 18 February 124$\frac{6}{7}$.
[3] MS. 'Sapson'.'
[4] MS. 'pro.'
[5] MS. 'eodem.'
[6] Five names.
[7] Four names.
[8] Six names.

The township of Sudborough finds pledges of being before the justices of the forest, because it allowed Maurice de Meht to carry away the skin of the doe.

The chattels of Ralph the son of Mabel were taken into the hand of the lord king, and appraised by the verderers and foresters at nine shillings, and they were delivered in bail to Thomas of Grafton, who dwells in Sudborough.

Robert of Grafton, the fugitive, and William the son of Henry had no chattels.

Maurice de Meht was not taken because he said that he was with Sir Robert Passelewe, then justice of the forest.

It happened on the Monday [2] next before the feast of St. Matthias the apostle, in the thirty-first year about vespers, that Simon Abbot and William Scot, his companion, walking foresters in the park of Brigstock, went between the wood of Ralph of St. Samson and the park of Brigstock; and they met Henry the son of Gervais, the fisher of Islip; and they asked him who he was; and he said that he was with Sir Henry of Drayton, knight. And the aforesaid foresters sent after the verderers of the country, who came and questioned him about his company. And the said Henry charged Robert the son of Quenyl with harbouring, and Ralph the son of Robert Quenyl with complicity, and William of Drayton the son of Sir Henry of Drayton with complicity. And out of suspicion the verderers and foresters searched the house of Robert the son of Quenyl, and they found a fletch in it, bloody and broken. The same Henry the son of Gervais of Islip finds pledges of being before the justices of the forest . . .[6]

Robert the son of Quenyl finds pledges for having harboured Ralph his son, to wit . . .[7]

Ralph the son of Robert the son of Quenyl finds pledges of being before the justices, to wit . . .[7]

William the son of Sir Henry of Drayton finds pledges of being before the justices for the same offence, to wit . . .[8]

Be it remembered that the fletch found in the house of Robert the son of Quenyl was delivered to Sir Robert Basset, a verderer.

These are the pledges of Robert the son of William of Lowick being before the justices for suspicion . . .[6]

Plegii Walteri filii Geruasii pro suspeccione:—Hugo Pinctor, Henricus de Sutton', Radulfus Pinctor, Adam de Yslep, Iohannes filius Godwyni.

[1] Anno tricesimo primo. Accidit die [2] Lune proxima post festum sancte Trinitatis anno tricesimo primo quod datum fuit intelligi forestariis de balliua de Rokingham quod vna bissa capta fuit apud le Risenebrige per leporarios. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio coram viridariis et forestariis per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, scilicet, Geytinton', Neutone, Stanerne, Paruam Acle.

Geytintone venit et, iurata, dicit quod nichil inde scit nec aliquem habet suspectum nec aliquem malefactorem sciunt esse in foresta domini regis.

Neuton' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Stanerne venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Parua Acle venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

[3] Anno tricesimo secundo. Accidit die [4] Lune proxima post festum sancti Michaelis anno tricesimo secundo quod malefactores intrauerunt balliuam de firma de Bricstok', quos cum forestarii perceperunt prosecuti sunt malefactores in magnam trencheam inter Bricstok' et Liueden' cum uillata de Bricstok' et nullum eorum capere potuerunt. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio coram viridariis et forestariis patrie per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Bricstok', Liueden', Sutburg', Lufwyc.

Bricstok' uenit et, iurata, dicit quod nullum eorum cognouit.

Liuedene uenit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Sutburg' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Lufwyc venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Set post inquisicionem factam omnes uillate cum uiridariis et forestariis scrutauerunt magnam trencheam et inuenerunt capud cuiusdam zouris cum intralibus. Et liberatum fuit capud Henrico filio Wydonis de Bricstok' et Gilberto ad Stagnum usque aduentum iusticiariorum de foresta.

[1] This entry is written on a schedule to the roll.
[2] 27 May 1247.
[3] See p. 30 above.
[4] 5 October 1248.

The pledges of Walter the son of Gervais for suspicion are :—Hugh the painter, Henry of Sutton, Ralph the painter, Adam of Islip and John the son of Godwin.

In the thirty-first year. It happened on the Monday[2] next after the feast of the Holy Trinity, in the thirty-first year, that the foresters of the bailiwick of Rockingham were given to understand that a hind had been taken by greyhounds at Rising Bridge. And thereupon an inquisition was made before the verderers and foresters by four neighbouring townships, to wit Geddington, Newton, Stanion, Little Oakley.

Geddington comes and, being sworn, says that it knows nothing thereof, nor does it suspect anyone, nor know of any evil doer in the forest of the lord king.

Newton comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Stanion comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Little Oakley comes and, being sworn, says the same.

In the thirty-second year. It happened on the Monday[4] next after the feast of St. Michael, in the thirty-second year, that malefactors entered the bailiwick of Brigstock Farming. And when the foresters perceived them they, together with the township of Brigstock, followed them as far as the great clearing between Brigstock and Lyveden; and they could take none of them. And upon this an inquisition was made before the verderers and foresters of the country by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Brigstock, Lyveden, Sudborough and Lowick.

Brigstock comes and, being sworn, says that it recognised none of them.

Lyveden comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Sudborough comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Lowick comes and, being sworn, says the same.

But after the inquisition was made all the townships, together with the verderers and foresters, searched the great clearing, and found the head of a certain soar, together with its entrails. And the head was delivered to Henry the son of Guy of Brigstock and Gilbert atte Pool to keep until the coming of the justices of the forest.

Anno tricesimo secundo. [1] Accidit die [2] Veneris proxima ante Purificacionem anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo secundo quod Ricardus de Wynewyc, wodeward abbatis de Pipwell' in Lutlehawe, venit in Lutelhawe, et inuenit vnum ceruum mortuum bersatum in femore dextro cum quadam sagitta barbelata. Dictus vero Ricardus de Wynewyc intimauit hoc forestariis domini regis et viridariis patrie. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio die [3] Sabbati proxima sequenti apud Lutelhawe coram viridariis et forestariis patrie per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Carelton', Acle Magnam, Ruston', Cotingha'.

Carelton' uenit et, iurata, dicit quod neminem habet suspectum.

Acle venit et dicit idem.

Ruston' uenit et dicit idem.

Memorandum de plegiis.

Cotingha' non uenit; ideo inuenit plegios coram iusticiariis de foresta.

Caro autem data fuit infirmis de Rokingha'. Et sagitta et capud cerui et pellis tradita fuerunt Iohanni Louet, tunc viridario, custodienda usque aduentum iusticiariorum de foresta.

Hec nomina plegiorum Ricardi de Wynewyc, inuentoris dicti cerui, de ueniendo coram iusticiariis de foresta :—Ricardus Romanus, Galfridus in angulo de Acle.

[4] Anno tricesimo secundo. [5] Accidit die [6] Sabbati proxima ante Dominicam Palmarum circa meridiem, venit dominus Walterus de Grey transiens per mediam landam de Banifeld, et quatuor armigeri et tres garciones veniebant post ipsum, ducentes tres leporarios, quos fecerunt curere ad vnam herdiam bestiarum in landa predicta usque coopertam bosci. Et Willelmus clericus dicti W. et Iohannes garcio eiusdem et Ricardus de Aslageby sequebantur leporarios. Interim superuenerunt forestarii, scilicet Henricus de Kyrkefeld et Radulfus Saracenus, et ceperunt dictum Willelmum clericum et Iohannem hominem suum et equum et leporarios, et dictum Ricardum. Et in crastino facta fuit inquisicio per quatuor uillatas propinquiores coram viridariis et forestariis patrie, videlicet, per Corby, Cotingham, Acle, Carelton'. Coreby venit et, iurata, dicit quod nescit vtrum leporarii euaserunt a lescia an spontanea uoluntate [7] dicti W. clerici et Iohannis hominis sui dimissi fuerunt curere ad bestias; set bene constat ei quod dicti leporarii cucurrerunt ad bestias usque [8] couertam bosci set nichil

[1] See p. 31 above.
[2] 31 January 124$\frac{7}{8}$.
[3] 1 February 124$\frac{7}{8}$.
[4] This entry is written on a schedule to the roll.
[5] See p. 31 above.
[6] 11 April 1248.
[7] MS. 'uolutate.'
[8] MS. 'us.'

In the thirty-second year. It happened on the Friday [2] next before the feast of the Purification, in the thirty-second year of the reign of King Henry, that Richard of Winwick, the woodward of the abbot of Pipwell in Littlehawe, came into Littlehawe and found a dead hart which had been shot in the right thigh with a certain barbed arrow. And the said Richard of Winwick informed the foresters of the lord King and the verderers of the country of this. And thereupon an inquisition was made on the Saturday [3] next following at Littlehawe before the verderers and foresters of the country by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Carlton, Great Oakley, Rushton, and Cottingham.

Carlton comes and, being sworn, says that it suspects nobody.

Oakley comes and says the same.

Rushton comes and says the same.

Cottingham does not come, therefore it finds pledges of being before the justices of the forest.

The flesh was given to the sick of Rockingham. And the arrow and the hart's head and its skin were delivered to John Lovet, then a verderer, to keep until the coming of the justices of the forest.

These are the names of the pledges of Richard of Winwick, the finder of the said hart, coming before the justices of the forest :— Richard the Roman and Geoffrey atte Nook of Oakley.

In the thirty-second year. It happened on the Saturday [6] next before Palm Sunday about midday that Sir Walter de Grey came across the middle of Beanfield lawn, and four esquires and three boys came after him leading three greyhounds, which they caused to run after a herd of beasts in the lawn aforesaid as far as the covert of the wood. And William, the clerk of the said Walter, and John his page, and Richard of Aslackby followed the greyhounds. In the meantime the foresters, to wit Henry of Churchfield and Ralph the Saracen, came up, and took the said William the clerk and John his man, and a horse and the greyhounds and the said Richard. And on the morrow an inquisition was made before the verderers and foresters of the country by four neighbouring townships, to wit, by Corby, Cottingham, Oakley and Carlton. Corby comes and, being sworn, says that it knows not whether the greyhounds escaped from the leash or were released of the free will of the said William the clerk and John his man to run after the beasts ; but it is quite sure that the said greyhounds ran after the beasts as far as the covert of

ceperunt. Et prenominati missi fuerunt apud Rokingham ad inprisonandum. Et deliberati fuerunt per preceptum domini Roberti Passel'.

Anno tricesimo secundo. Inquisicio facta die [1] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Mathei apostoli anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo secundo coram Willelmo de Norhampt', tunc balliuo foreste, et coram viridariis et forestariis patrie per Bricstok', Sutburg', Liueden', Wadenho, Audeuincle de morte Stephani de Multona, forestarii, in foresta domini regis occisi.

Bricstoke venit et, iurata, dicit quod Galfridus de Sutburgo capellanus ministrans in ecclesia beati Petri de Audeuincle cum domino Rogero, rectore dicte ecclesie, occidit dictum Stephanum cum quadam sagitta barbelata stans super quandam quercum in bosco Willelmi de Musca. Et nullum habent suspectum de morte dicti Stephani nisi dictum capellanum.

Anno tricesimo tercio. [2] Inquisicio facta die [3] Animarum anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo tercio coram Willelmo de Norhampt', tunc balliuo foreste, et coram viridariis et forestariis patrie apud Pipwell' de quodam ceruo de quo Willelmo de Insula inputabatur quod deberet illum cepisce in Loutelund', videlicet, per quatuor villatas propinquiores de Loutelond, videlicet, per Deseburg', Braybroc, Hetherinton', Torp sub bosco.

Deseburg' venit et, iurata, dicit quod Willelmus de Insula inmunis [4] est a capcione illius cerui de quo inputabatur; et nullum malefactorem cognoscit in foresta domini regis.

Braybroc venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Hetherinton' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Memorandum. Torp sub bosco non uenit.

Anno tricesimo tercio. Accidit die [5] Veneris in vigilia sancti Edmundi regis anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo tercio quod Ricardus de Horton', tunc forestarius eques in parco de Bricstok', inuenit in quodam fossato sub villa de Bouhton' quatuor membra cuiusdam bestie, que cum inuenisset dictus Ricardus uidit tres homines uenientes

[1] 23 September 1248.

[2] See p. 36 above.

[3] Monday, 2 November 1248.

[4] The true reading of this word is very doubtful.

[5] 19 November 1248. The feast of St. Edmund king and martyr seems to have been commemorated on 20 November, which in this year was itself a Friday.

wood, but they took nothing. And the before named were sent to Rockingham to be imprisoned. And afterwards they were delivered by the order of Sir Robert Passelewe.

In the thirty-second year. An inquisition was made on the Wednesday[1] next after the feast of St. Matthew the Apostle in the thirty-second year of the reign of king Henry before William of Northampton, then bailiff of the forest, and before the verderers and foresters of the country by Brigstock, Sudborough, Lyveden, Wadenhoe and Aldwinkle concerning the death of Stephen of Moulton, a forester, who was slain in the forest of the lord king.

Brigstock comes and, being sworn, says that Geoffrey of Sudborough, a chaplain, serving in the church of St. Peter at Aldwinkle with Sir Roger, the rector of the said church, stood on a certain oak in the wood of William de la Mouche and killed the said Stephen with a certain barbed arrow. And they suspect nobody of the death of the said Stephen except the said chaplain.

In the thirty-third year. An inquisition was made on All Souls' day[3] in the thirty-third year of the reign of king Henry before William of Northampton, then bailiff of the forest, and before the verderers and foresters of the country at Pipewell concerning a hart, of which it was imputed to William de l'Isle that he was supposed to have taken it in Loatland, to wit, by four townships neighbouring on Loatland, to wit, by Desborough, Braybrooke, Harrington and Thorpe Underwood.

Desborough comes and, being sworn, says that William de l'Isle is clear of the taking of that hart, of which it was imputed to him; and it knows of no malefactor in the forest of the lord king.

Braybrooke comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Harrington comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Thorpe Underwood does not come.

In the thirty-third year. It happened on Friday[5] the vigil of St. Edmund the king in the thirty-third year of the reign of king Henry, that Richard of Horton, then riding forester in the park of Brigstock, found four limbs of a certain beast in a certain ditch near the town of Boughton. And when he had found them, the said Richard saw three men coming from the park of Brigstock,

de parco de Bricstok' itinerantes per altam uiam uersus Pyhtesl' quos dictus Ricardus habuit suspectos quorum nomina sunt hec :—Thomas Basset filius domini Radulfi Basset de Weledon', Philippus Walens', Willelmus le Vacher, quos arestauit pro suspeccione. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio die [1] sancti Edmundi regis anno predicto apud Bouton' coram Willelmo de Norhampt', tunc balliuo foreste, et coram viridariis et forestariis patrie per quatuor villatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Geytinton', Verketon', Wycle, Bouhton'.

Geytinton' venit et, iurata, dicit quod nichil scit inde et neminem habet suspectum de transgressione dicte venacionis.

Verketon' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Vycle venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Bouhton' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Memorandum de T. Basset.

Caro data fuit leprosis de Trapston'.

Predicti vero Philippus Valens' et Willelmus le Vacher inuenerunt plegios pro suspeccione de essendo coram iusticiariis de foresta, videlicet [2] . . .

[3] Anno tricesimo tercio. Accidit die [4] Pasche anno rengni regis Henrici tricesimo tercio quod Simon de Ouerton', persona de Walde, venit in campo de Waldegraue et cepit ibidem vnum capriolum die Pasche circa horam primam. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio apud boscum de Malesle die [5] Lune proxima ante festum beati Marce ewangeliste anno eodem coram Willelmo de Norhampt', tunc balliuo foreste, et coram viridariis [et] forestariis patrie per quatuor villatas propinquiores, videlicet, per Waldam, Waldegrauam, Haninton', Faxton'.

Walda uenit et, iurata, dicit quod Simon de Ouerton', persona de Walde, uenit die Pasche circa horam primam et cepit vnum capriolum in campo de Waldegraue cum leporariis.

Waldegraue uenit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Haninton' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

Faxton' venit et, iurata, dicit idem.

[6] Anno tricesimo tercio. Accidit die [7] Iouis in festo sancti Iohannis ante portam Latinam anno tricesimo tercio quod Radulfus de Susex et Adam, socius suus, forestarii pedites in balliua de Firma,

[1] Friday, 20 November 1248.
[2] Twelve names.
[3] See p. 31 above.
[4] Sunday, 4 April 1249.
[5] 19 April 1249.
[6] See p. 32 above.
[7] 6 May 1249.

journeying along the highway towards Pytchley, and the said Richard suspected them, whose names are these:—Thomas Basset, the son of Sir Ralph Basset of Weldon, Philip the Welshman and William le Vacher; and he arrested them on suspicion. And thereupon an inquisition was made on the day[1] of St. Edmund the king, in the year aforesaid at Boughton, before William of Northampton, then bailiff of the forest, and before the verderers and foresters of the country by four neighbouring townships, to wit by Geddington, Warkton, Weekley, and Boughton.

Geddington comes and, being sworn, says that it knows nothing thereof, and suspects nobody of trespass against the said venison.

Warkton comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Weekley comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Boughton comes and, being sworn, says the same.

The flesh was given to the lepers of Thrapston.

And the aforesaid Philip the Welshman and William le Vacher on account of suspicion found pledges of their being before the justices, to wit, . . .

In the thirty-third year. It happened on Easter day[4] in the thirty-third year that Simon of Overton, parson of Old, came into the field of Walgrave and took there a roe about the first hour. And thereupon an inquisition was made at Mawsley wood on the Monday[5] next before the feast of St. Mark the Evangelist, in the same year before William of Northampton, then the bailiff of the forest, and before the verderers and foresters of the country by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Old, Walgrave, Hannington and Faxton.

Old comes and, being sworn, says that Simon of Overton, parson of Old, came on Easter day about the first hour and took a roe in the field of Walgrave with greyhounds.

Walgrave comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Hannington comes and, being sworn, says the same.

Faxton comes and, being sworn says the same.

In the thirty-third year. It happened on Thursday[7] on the feast of St. John before the Latin gate in the thirty-third year that Ralph of Sussex and Adam, his fellow, walking foresters in the Farming

obuiauerunt cuidam garcioni de Wadenho in foresta, scilicet in Lochawe qui vocatur Rogerus filius Laurencii de Wadenho cum arcu et sagittis barbelatis et vna sagitta valisca; quem cum uidissent, forestarii ceperunt eum propter suspeccionem, et missus fuit apud Norhampt' ad inprisonandum, et liberatus domino Simoni de Trop tunc vicecomiti Norhampt'.

Memorandum de arcu et sagittis.

Arcus et sagitte liberate fuerunt Ricardo de Audeuincle,[1] tunc uiridario.

Anno tricesimo quarto. Accidit circiter diem [2] Veneris proximam post festum sancte Marie Egiptiate anno tricesimo quarto quod quedam dama euasit de parco domini regis Norhampt' et intrauit campum de Brampton'; quam, cum homines domine Hugelyne de Brampton' percepissent, venit quidam de suis cuius nomen ingnoratur, equitans super equm bay cum duobus leporariis, de quibus vnus eorum erat teyngre et alter albus. Et prosecutus fuit dictam damam usque in campum de Pyceford; et ibi cepit dictam damam. Et super hoc facta fuit inquisicio coram viridariis et forestariis patrie per quatuor uillatas propinquiores, videlicet, Pyzeford, Brickelesworthe, Sywell', Holokot'.[3]

Pyzeford venit et, iurata, dicit quod quedam dama euadiata fuit de parco de Norhampt' et intrauit campum de Brampton'. Et venit quidam homo domine Hugeline de Neuil' cum duobus leporariis et prosequebatur dictam damam, et cepit eam in campo de Pizeford, et duxit dictam venacionem secum in domo domine Hugeline. Set non possunt atachiari quia manent extra forestam.

Brickeleworthe, Sywell', Holokote, iurate, dicunt idem.

[4] Inquisicio facta apud Stanerne die [5] Veneris proxima post Purificacionem anno tricesimo quarto de Willelmo Mauclerc [6] capto cum una trape per quatuor uillatas, scilicet, per Bricstok', Benifeld', Sutburg' et Stoke.

Brikestok', iurata, uenit et dicit quod Willelmus Mauclerc fecit unam trappe ad venacionem capiendam et neminem alium habuit suspectum.

Benifeld', Sutburg, Stoke, iurate, dicunt idem.

[1] MS. 'Audeuicle.'
[2] 8 April 1250.
[3] This word is most distinctly so written in the roll.
[4] See p. 32 above.
[5] 4 February $12\frac{49}{50}$.
[6] MS. 'Mauclec.'

bailiwick, met a certain boy of Wadenhoe, who is called Roger the son of Lawrence of Wadenhoe, in the forest, to wit, in Lockhawe with a bow and barbed arrows, and a Welsh arrow. And the foresters, when they saw him, took him on suspicion; and he was sent to Northampton to be imprisoned; and he was delivered to Sir Simon of Thorp, then sheriff of Northampton.

The bow and arrows were delivered to Richard of Aldwinkle, then a verderer.

In the thirty-fourth year. It happened about the Friday [2] next after the feast of St. Mary of Egypt in the thirty-fourth year that a certain doe escaped from the lord king's park at Northampton, and went into the field of Brampton. And when the men of the lady Hugelyn of Brampton perceived it, one of them, whose name is not known, came riding on a bay horse with two greyhounds, one of which was tawny and the other white. And he followed the said doe as far as the field of Pitsford; and there he took the said doe. And thereupon an inquisition was made before the verderers and foresters of the country by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Pitsford, Brixworth, Sywell, and Holcot.

Pitsford comes and, being sworn, says that a certain doe was driven to escape from the park of Northampton, and it went into the field of Brampton. And a certain man of the lady Hugelyn de Neville came with two greyhounds, and followed the said doe and took it in the field of Pitsford, and he brought the said venison with him to the house of the lady Hugelyn; but they cannot be attached, because they dwell outside the forest.

Brixworth, Sywell and Holcot, being sworn, say the same.

An inquisition concerning William Mauclerc who was taken with a trap was made at Stanion on the Friday [5] next after the feast of the Purification in the thirty-fourth year by four townships, to wit, by Brigstock, Benefield, Sudborough and Stoke.

Brigstock, being sworn, comes and says that William Mauclerc made a trap for taking venison, and it suspects nobody else.

Benefield, Sudborough and Stoke, being sworn, say the same.

Predicta trappa liberata fuit Henrico Preposito de Bricstok' et Henrico filio Wydonis. Et dictus Willelmus missus fuit ad prisonam. Et fuit tunc vicecomes Norhampt' dominus Symon de Trop.

Venacio data per dominum regem.

Anno tricesimo. Cometissa Leycest' habuit[1] in foresta de Rokingha' de dono domini regis ad festum apostolorum Petri et Pauli[2] anno tricesimo septem damos.

Dominus Galfridus de Langeleye habuit[3] in eadem foresta de dono domini regis eodem anno circiter eundem festum tres damos.

Anno tricesimo primo. Nicholaus de Kyryel habuit in eadem foresta ad festum[4] sancti Petri ad uincula de dono domini regis duos damos anno tricesimo primo.

Commetissa Leycest' habuit[5] in eadem foresta de dono domini regis ad Natiuitatem beate Marie[6] decem damos anno eodem.

Dominus G. de Langel' habuit[7] in eadem foresta de dono domini regis ad festum sancti Laurencii[8] anno eodem duos damos.

Robertus de Mares habuit[9] in eadem foresta de dono domini regis circa eundem festum vnum damum.

Aymaricus de Lezynan habuit[10] in eadem foresta decem damos.

Anno tricesimo secundo. Dominus R. comes Cornubye uenit in foresta de Rokingha' circiter Assumpcionem beate Marie[11] et cepit in parco et extra parcum bestias ad placitum anno tricesimo secundo.

Idem comes in redditu suo de Norhtpatria cepit in parco et extra parcum bestias ad placitum circiter Exaltacionem sancte Crucis[12] anno eodem.

Dominus Simon de Monte Forti habuit in balliua de Rokingha' circiter ad uincula[13] sancti Petri de dono domini regis duodecim damos anno tricesimo secundo.

[1] By letters close dated 17 August 1246. See Close Roll 60, m. 5.
[2] Friday, 29 June 1246.
[3] By letters close dated 3 August 1246. See Close Roll 60, m. 6.
[4] Thursday, 1 August 1247.
[5] By letters close dated 7 July 1246. See Close Roll 61, m. 6.
[6] Sunday, 8 September 1247.
[7] By letters close dated 7 August 1247. See Close Roll 61, m. 5.
[8] Saturday, 10 August 1247.
[9] By letters close dated 11 August 1247. See Close Roll 61, m. 5.
[10] By letters close dated 28 August 1247 he was given twenty bucks. See Close Roll 61, m. 4.
[11] Saturday, 15 August 1248.
[12] Monday, 14 September 1248.
[13] Saturday, 1 August 1248.

The aforesaid trap was delivered to Henry the reeve of Brigstock, and Henry the son of Guy. And the said William was sent to prison. And the sheriff of Northampton was then Sir Simon of Thorp.

Venison given by the lord king.

In the thirtieth year. The countess of Leicester had seven bucks in the forest of Rockingham of the gift of the lord king on the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul.[2]

Sir Geoffrey of Langley had three bucks in the same forest of the gift of the lord king in the same year about the time of the same feast.

In the thirty-first year. Nicholas de Criel had two bucks in the same forest of the gift of the lord king on the feast[4] of St Peter's Chains in the thirty-first year.

The countess of Leicester had ten bucks in the same forest of the gift of the lord king on the day of the Nativity of the Blessed Mary[6] in the same year.

Sir Geoffrey of Langley had two bucks in the same forest of the gift of the lord king on the feast of St. Lawrence[8] in the same year.

Robert de Mares had one buck in the same forest of the gift of the lord king about the time of the same feast.

Aymar de Lusignan had ten bucks in the same forest.

In the thirty-second year. Sir Richard, earl of Cornwall, came into the forest of Rockingham about the time of the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary,[11] and took beasts in the park and outside the park at his pleasure in the thirty-second year.

The same earl on his return from the North Country took beasts in the park and outside the park at his pleasure about the time of the feast of Exaltation of the Holy Cross[12] in the same year.

Sir Simon de Montfort had twelve bucks in the bailiwick of Rockingham of the gift of the lord king about the time of the feast[13] of St. Peter's Chains in the thirty-second year.

Dominus Siluester, episcopus Carlol', habuit [1] in eadem foresta de dono domini regis ad festum sancti Michaelis [2] anno tricesimo secundo tres damos.

Anno tricesimo tercio. Dominus rex venit bis in foresta de Rokingha' circiter festum sancte Katerine [3] anno tricesimo tercio et circiter ad uincula sancti Petri [4] anno tricesimo tercio et cepit bestias ad placitum.

Dominus Willelmus de Ferariis, comes de Dereby, habuit de dono domini regis in foresta de Rokingha' quinque damos uiuos et decem damas uiuas.

Abbas Westmon' habuit in eadem foresta de dono domini regis octo damas.

Dominus G. de Langeleye habuit in foresta de Rokingham de dono domini regis duas damas.

Dominus Willelmus de Cantelupo habuit in foresta de Rokingham tres damos de dono domini regis.

Venacio capta sine waranto.[5]

Anno tricesimo. Dominus episcopus Lincoln' cepit in Bolax die [6] Martis proxima ante Natale anno tricesimo vnam bissam et unam cheuerel.

Dominus Gwydo de Rocheford cepit in parco de Bricstok' in vigilia [7] Purificacionis beate Marie anno eodem vnam damam et vnam broket dame.

Anno tricesimo primo. Abbas Westmon' cepit in balliua de Ferma die [8] sancti Barnabe apostoli anno tricesimo primo vnum damum et vnum pricard dami.

Dominus Iohannes de Plesset' cepit in Gatesle die [9] sancti Botulfi abbatis anno eodem vnum damum et vnum broket dami.

Edmundus de Lacy cepit vnum ceruum in balliua de Rokingham die [10] Sabbati proxima ante festum sancte Margarete anno tricesimo primo.

[1] By letters close dated 23 May 1248. Close Roll 62, m. 8.

[2] Tuesday, 29 September 1248.

[3] Wednesday, 25 November 1248.

[4] Sunday, 1 August 1249.

[5] The five following paragraphs apparently refer to deer taken by bishops, earls and barons, given by article 11 of the Charter of the Forest. The right was confined to 'one or two beasts.'

[6] 19 December 1245.

[7] Thursday, 1 February 124$\frac{5}{6}$.

[8] Tuesday, 11 June 1247.

[9] Monday, 17 June 1247.

[10] 13 July 1247.

Sir Silvester, bishop of Carlisle, had three bucks in the same forest of the gift of the lord king on Michaelmas day [2] in the thirty-second year.

In the thirty-third year. The lord king came twice into the forest of Rockingham, about the time of the feast of St. Katherine [3] in the thirty-third year, and about the time of the feast [4] of St. Peter's Chains in the same year; and he took beasts at his pleasure.

Sir William de Ferrières, earl of Derby, had five live bucks and ten live does of the gift of the lord king in the forest of Rockingham.

The abbot of Westminster had eight does in the same forest of the gift of the lord king.

Sir Geoffrey of Langley had two does in the forest of Rockingham of the gift of the lord king.

Sir William de Chanteloup had three bucks in the forest of Rockingham of the gift of the lord king.

Venison taken without warrant.

In the thirtieth year. The lord bishop of Lincoln took a hind and a roe in Bulax on the Tuesday [6] next before Christmas Day in the thirtieth year.

Sir Gui de Rochefort took a doe and a doe's brocket in the park of Brigstock in the vigil [7] of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the same year.

In the thirty-first year. The abbot of Westminster took a buck and a buck's prickett in the Farming bailiwick on the day [8] of St. Barnabas the Apostle in the thirty-first year.

Sir John du Plessis took a buck and a buck's brocket in Gatesley on the day [9] of St. Botolph the Abbot in the same year.

Edmund de Lassy took a hart in the bailiwick of Rockingham on the Saturday [10] next before the feast of St. Margaret in the thirty-first year.

Anno tricesimo secundo. Henricus filius comitis Leycest' cepit in Bolax die[1] sancti Martini anno tricesimo secundo vnum broket dami.

Gwydo de Rocheford cepit in parco de Bricstok' ad festum sancti Andree[2] vnam broket dami anno eodem.

Dominus Iohannes de Plesset cepit in parco de Bricstok' in crastino[3] sancti Nicholai anno eodem cum leporariis suis duas damas.

Abbas Westmon' cepit in parco de Bricstok' in crastino[4] sancti Iacobi anno eodem vnum damum.

Item dominus R. Passel' cepit in balliua de Rokingha' ad Assumpcionem beate Marie[5] anno eodem duos zouros cerui quos misit domino regi.

Comes de Aubemarl' cepit ad Risonebrige die[6] sancti Bricii vnam damam.

Gwydo de Rocheford cepit vnam broket dame in parco de Bricstok' circiter festum sancti Mathie apostoli.[7]

Episcopus Karloliens' cepit vnum damum in balliua de Rokingham die[8] Sabbati proxima post Ascensionem.

Anno tricesimo tercio. Petrus de Orival cepit in parco de Bricstok' septem damos.[9]

Willelmus de Cantelupo cepit in Barnegraue vnam damam et vnam broket dame et vnum cheuerel.

Henricus filius comitis Leycest' cepit die[10] apostolorum Simonis et Iude anno tricesimo tercio vnam damam et vnum fetonem in balliua de Rokingha'.

Anno tricesimo quarto. Dictus Gwydo de Rocheford cepit in parco de Bricstok' die[11] Sabbati proxima post festum Omnium Sanctorum anno tricesimo quarto duas damas.

Idem Gwydo cepit in campo de Liueden' die[12] Sabbati proxima ante festum sancti Edmundi anno tricesimo quarto duas damas.

[1] Monday, 11 November 1247.
[2] Saturday, 30 November 1247.
[3] Saturday, 7 December 1247.
[4] Sunday, 26 July 1248.
[5] Saturday, 15 August 1248.
[6] Wednesday, 13 November 1247.
[7] Monday, 24 February $124\frac{7}{8}$.
[8] 30 May 1248.
[9] This is the only case in the list in which more than two beasts were taken.
[10] Wednesday, 28 October 1248.
[11] 6 November 1249.
[12] 13 November 1249.

In the thirty-second year. Henry the son of the earl of Leicester took a buck's brocket in Bulax on St. Martin's day [1] in the thirty-second year.

Gui de Rochefort took a buck's brocket in the park of Brigstock on the feast of St. Andrew [2] in the same year.

Sir John du Plessis took two does with his greyhounds in the park of Brigstock on the morrow [3] of St. Nicholas in the same year.

The abbot of Westminster took a buck in the park of Brigstock on the morrow [4] of St. James in the same year.

And Sir Robert Passelewe took two hart's soars in the bailiwick of Rockingham on the day [5] of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the same year ; and he sent them to the lord king.

The count d'Aumale took a doe at Rising Bridge on St. Brice's day.[6]

Gui de Rochefort took a doe's brocket in the park of Brigstock about the feast of St. Matthias the Apostle.[7]

The bishop of Carlisle took a buck in the bailiwick of Rockingham on the Saturday [8] next after Ascension Day.

In the thirty-third year. Peter d'Airvault took seven bucks in the park of Brigstock.

William de Chanteloup took a doe and a doe's brocket and a roe in Barnegrave.

Henry the son of the earl of Leicester took a doe and a fawn in the bailiwick of Rockingham, on the feast [10] of the Apostles Simon and Jude in the thirty-third year.

In the thirty-fourth year. The said Gui de Rochefort took two does in the park of Brigstock on the Saturday [11] next after the feast of All Saints in the thirty-fourth year.

The same Gui took two does in the field of Lyveden on the Saturday [12] next before the feast of St. Edmund in the thirty-fourth year.

XII (b).[1]

[INQUISICIONES DE UENACIONE IN FORESTA DE ROCKINGHAM TEMPORE HUGONIS DE GOLDINGHAM.]

[2] Accidit die[3] Iouis in vigilia sanctorum Fabiani et Sebastiani anno regni regis Henrici tricesimo quinto quod cum Galfridus Hog, Iohannes Iue, forestarii domini regis pedites de parco de Brixstok', iuissent in parco eodem inuenerunt vnam trappam tendatam in Aldnatheshawe, et audierunt vnum hominem secantem in parco infra noctem et propter spissitudinem bosci et obscuritatem noctis ad eum venire non potuerunt. Et propter suspeccionem quam habuerunt versus Robertum le Noble de Suburg', capellanum, exierunt boscum uersus Suburg' ad insidiandum si aliquis exisset de bosco uersus villam; ita quod obuiauerunt dicto Roberto capellano qui venit de bosco et tulit vnam branchiam de viridi quercu, et vnam hachiam in manu sua. Forestarii uero exigebant ab eo vadium et plegium; et ipse non potuit eis plegios inuenire, ita quod eum duxerunt ad villam de Brixstok' ad domum Roberti le N.[4] . . .

Mane . . . forestarii et viridarii iuerunt ad domum suam apud Suburg' ad cerchiam faciendam ita quod inuenerunt infra domum suam duas sagittas barbatas sine fleck' et cleyam de quadam trappa cum corda trappe fracta in duas partes super quam fuit pilus bestialis.

Catalla ibidem inuenta preciata fuerunt, scilicet, vnus busellus frumenti de precio quinque denariorum, vnus bussellus fabri de precio trium denariorum, dimidius bussellus auene precii duorum denariorum, vna cophia cum discis ciphis et salsariis precii duodecim denariorum, vna equa precii octo denariorum, renn' ibidem inuent' precii duodecim denariorum, busca inventa in curia sua, precii sex denariorum. Summa quatuor solidi.

Hec predicta catalla capta in manu domini regis tradita fuerunt quatuor hominibus[5] de villa de Suburg scilicet Willelmo filio Osmundi, Roberto Page preposito, Henrico filio Willelmi Dolfyn et Goschelino de

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Treasury of Receipt*, No. 65.

[2] See p. 33 above.

[3] 19 January $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[4] A few lines of the MS. are omitted here because it is damaged. But enough of them remain to make it clear that Robert le Noble escaped from custody.

[5] In the eyre roll they are stated to have been delivered to Hugh le Noble of Sudborough.

XII (b).

[INQUISITIONS CONCERNING THE VENISON IN THE FOREST OF ROCKINGHAM, IN THE TIME OF HUGH OF GOLDINGHAM.]

It happened on Thursday[3] the vigil of Saints Fabian and Sebastian in the thirty-fifth year that when Geoffrey Hog, and John Ive, the walking foresters of the lord king of the park of Brigstock, were on their way in the same park, they found a trap set in Aldnatheshawe; and they heard a man cutting wood by night in the park, and on account of the thickness of the wood and the darkness of the night they could not come to him. And on account of the suspicion which they had against Robert le Noble of Sudborough, chaplain, they left the wood for Sudborough to watch in concealment to see if anyone left the wood for the town; and so they met the said Robert the chaplain, who came from the wood and carried in his hand a branch of green oak and an axe. And the foresters demanded gage and pledge of him; and he could not find them pledges, and so they took him to the town of Brigstock to the house of Robert le N. . . .

In the morning the foresters and verderers went to his house at Sudborough to make search; and so they found in his house two barbed arrows without fletches and the woodwork of a certain trap with the string of the trap broken into two parts; and upon the string was hair from deer.

The chattels found there were appraised, to wit, a bushel of wheat, of the price of five pence, a bushel of beans of the price of three pence; half a bushel of oats of the price of two pence; a chest with dishes, cups and saucers of the price of twelve pence, and a mare of the price of eight pence. A pelice was found there of the price of twelve pence; and wood was found in his court of the price of six pence. Total, four shillings.

The aforesaid chattels, which were taken into the hands of the lord king, were given to four men of the town of Sudborough, to wit, William the son of Osmund, Robert Page the reeve, Henry the son of

Dene ut respondeant de precio coram iusticiariis itinerantibus de foresta.

Corda fracta et cleya de trappa commisse fuerunt predictis quatuor hominibus ad tenendum coram iusticiariis.

Due sagitte fracte commisse fuerunt Ricardo de Audewincle, viridario, ad tenendum coram iusticiariis.

Peia de trappa inuenta in bosco tendata cum tota corda commissa fuit Mauricio de Solario de Brixstok' ad tenendum coram iusticiariis.

Per breue;[1] quatuor damas. Edmundus de Lascy cepit vnam damam in balliua de firma de Brixstok' in crastino[2] Purificacionis beate Marie anno eodem de dono domini regis.

Idem Edmundus cepit vnam bissam in eadem balliua die[3] Mercurii proxima sequenti.

Idem Edmundus cepit vnam damam in eadem balliua die[4] Sabbati proxima sequenti.

Idem Edmundus cepit vnam damam in balliua de parco die[5] Lune proxima sequenti.

Per breue;[6] tres damas. Vxor domini G. de Langel', iusticiarii foreste, fecit capere vnam damam in balliua de Rokingh' die[7] Lune proxima post Octabas Purificacionis beate Marie anno eodem; et vnam damam in balliua de parco die[8] Mercurii proxima sequenti; et vnam damam in eadem balliua die[9] Iouis proxima sequenti de dono domini regis.

[10] Accidit die[11] Lune in crastino Palmarum anno eodem quod, cum dominus Hugo de Goldingham, senescallus foreste, et Rogerus de Tyngewic, forestarius eques, venerunt de Carleton' post prandium ad introitum bosci Roberti de Hotoft, perceperunt vnum hominem equitem et vnum garcionem ipsum sequentem cum arcu et sagittis, qui statim

[1] By letters close dated 2 November 1250 the king gave him four does from the forest of Rockingham, which, however, were not to be taken from Beanfield Lawn or Geddington Grove. Close Roll 65, m. 25.

[2] Friday, 3 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[3] 8 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[4] 11 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[5] 13 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[6] By letters close dated 9 January $125\frac{1}{0}$ the king granted to her three does from the forest of Feckenham. In the close roll (No. 65, m. 21) the letters are enrolled, but the word Feckenham is crossed out and Rockingham written above it. In the margin are the words 'quia aliter in anno sequenti.' In the following year the king granted her by letters close dated 25 July 1252 three bucks in the forest of Feckenham. (Close Roll 66, m. 9.)

[7] 13 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[8] 15 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[9] 16 February $125\frac{0}{1}$.

[10] See p. 33 above.

[11] 10 April 1251.

William Dolfyn and Jocelin of Deene, to answer for their price before the justices in eyre of the forest.

The broken string and the woodwork of the trap were given to the aforesaid four men to produce before the justices.

The two broken arrows were given to Richard of Aldwinkle, the verderer, to produce before the justices.

The snare of the trap which was found set in the wood together with all the string was given to Maurice de Solers of Brigstock to produce before the justices.

By writ; four does. Edmund de Lassy took a doe in the bailiwick of Brigstock Farming on the morrow [2] of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the same year, of the gift of the lord king.

The same Edmund took a hind in the same bailiwick on the Wednesday [3] next following.

The same Edmund took a doe in the same bailiwick on the Saturday [4] next following.

The same Edmund took a doe in the bailiwick of the park on the Monday [5] next following.

By writ; three does. The wife of Sir Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest, caused a doe to be taken in the bailiwick of Rockingham on the Monday [7] next after the Octave of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the same year; and a doe in the bailiwick of the park on the Wednesday [8] next following; and a doe in the same bailiwick on the Thursday [9] next following, of the gift of the lord king.

It happened on Monday [11] the morrow of Palm Sunday in the same year, that when Sir Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, and Roger of Tingewick, the riding forester, came from Carlton after dinner to the entrance of the wood of Robert of Huttoft, they perceived a man on horseback and a page following him with a bow and arrows, who forthwith fled. Wherefore he was hailed on account

fugiit. Vnde propter fugam exclamatus de dictis H. et R., et secutus est, et captus infra coopertum. Dictus homo eques fugiendo captus fuit extra coopertum supertunica sua sanguinolenta et reuersa. Quesitus fuit vnde ille sanguis fuit, et ipse cognouit quod fuit de quodam cheuerello quem occidit, et ad quem cheuerellum reduxit dictum H. senescallum et Rogerum. Idem captus vocatus Rogerus Russel de Assewell', et garcio suus Willelmus filius Osberti de Seluiston'; et ambo missi fuerunt ad prisonam Norhamt'. Et vicecomes dominus Robertus Basset.

Arcus suus de if, et due sagitte barbate et tres sagitte genderese, et cutis dicti cheuerelli commisse fuerunt Iohanni Luuet, viridario, tenende coram iusticiariis foreste.

[1] Accidit die [2] Dominica proxima post Inuencionem sancte Crucis anno eodem quod Robertus de Corby et Galfridus Gos de eadem, et Robertus filius Godefridi le Dene de eadem, rettati de malefacto venacionis in foresta domini regis de Rokingham, capti fuerunt circa mediam noctem per dominum H. Goldingham, senescallum foreste, et Rogerum de Tyngewic. In domo dicti Roberti de Corby inuente fuerunt tresdecim sagitte wallenses sine arcu. In domo Galfridi Gos inuenta fuerunt vna pecia venacionis vnius dami supra carectam; et vna pecia venacionis vnius dame de costa, et vnus arcus cum corda, et septem sagitte barbate et vna parua sagitta et quinque fleck'.

Dicti tres malefactores retenti fuerunt et missi ad prisonam Norhampt'. Tunc vicecomes dominus Robertus Basset.[3]

Arcus cum corda et sagitte et fleck' et venacio commissi fuerunt Iohanni Luuet, viridario, ad tenendum coram iusticiariis.

in respectu. Accidit die [4] Pentecostes anno eodem quod duo homines cum arcubus et sagittis venerunt ante horam nonam de bosco de Twiwell' transseuntes usque le Rokes cum duobus leporariis, quorum vnus fuit niger coueire et alter fauf vestitus et vnus mastinus niger et sic transsierunt usque Hassokes et ceperunt ibidem vnam damam; et postea redierunt usque Acwellsyk' et ibi vniti fuerunt septem homines pedites et vnus homo eques et vnus garcio, qui duxit dictam venacionem super alium equum nigrum foliis et ramis coopertam, et octo leporarii. Et exierunt apud Heck' de Suburg' tendentes uersus

[1] See p. 33 above.
[2] 7 May 1251.
[3] See p. 34, note 2.
[4] 4 June 1251.

of his flight by the said Hugh and Roger; and he was followed and taken within the covert. The said man on horseback was taken, as he fled, outside the covert with his surcoat bloody and turned inside out. He was asked whence that blood came; and he confessed that it came from a certain roe, which he had killed; and he brought the said Hugh the steward and Roger back to the roe. The man who was taken was called Roger Russell of Ashwell; and his page William the son of Osbert of Silverstone. And both were sent to the prison of Northampton; and the sheriff was then Sir Robert Basset.

His bow of yew and three barbed arrows and three 'genderese' arrows and the skin of the said roe were given to John Lovet, the verderer, to produce before the justices of the forest.

It happened on the Sunday [2] next after the Invention of the Holy Cross in the same year that Robert of Corby and Geoffrey Gos of the same town and Robert the son of Godfrey le Dene of the same town, who were suspected of an evil deed to the venison in the lord king's forest of Rockingham, were taken about midnight by Sir Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, and Roger of Tingewick. In the house of the said Robert of Corby were found thirteen Welsh arrows without a bow. In the house of Geoffrey Gos was found a piece of venison from a buck upon a cart, and a piece of venison from the side of a buck, and a bow with a string, and seven barbed arrows, and a small arrow and five fletches.

The said three evil doers were detained and sent to the prison of Northampton, the sheriff being then Sir Robert Basset.

The bow with the string and the arrows and the fletches and the venison were entrusted to John Lovet, the verderer, to produce before the justices.

It happened on Whitsunday [4] in the same year that two men with bows and arrows came before the ninth hour from the wood of Twywell making their way to le Rokes, with two greyhounds, of which one was black brindled and the other fallow covered and a black mastiff; and so they made their way as far as Hassokes; and they took there a doe. And afterwards they returned to Acwellsike, and there seven men on foot and one on horseback and a page, who brought the said venison covered with leaves and boughs on another black horse, and eight greyhounds, joined them. And they left Sudborough at Heck'

Cattesheuyd' et sic intrauerunt boscum de Suburg'. Eodem uero die Iohannes Balun et Galfridus Hog, forestarii pedites de parco, venerunt de Brixstok' apud Tostisheuyd et ibi inuenerunt intrallium vnius dame.

Iohannes Spigurnel, forestarius eques,[1] et Iohannes Balun et Galfridus Hog et Walterus Trauers, forestarii pedites, dicunt per sacramentum suum quod suspeccionem habent de malefacto illo versus Willelmum de Drayton' et socios suos, quos non noscunt.

Postea die [2] Sabbati in vigilia sancte Trinitatis, conuocatis forestariis, viridariis coram domino H. de Goldingh', senescallo foreste, apud Acwellesik' et villatis ibidem propinquioribus, scilicet, Brixstok', Suburg', Grafton' cum Slipton', Lufwic et Islepp' ad inquirendum qui illi malefactores fuerunt et vnde venerunt, et quo redierunt.

Brixtok', iurata, nichil scit.

Suburg', iurata, nichil scit.

Grafton', iurata, nichil scit.

Slipton', iurata, nichil scit.

Lufwic et Islep', iurata, nichil scit.

Henricus filius Iohannis de Suburg', pastor ouium, dicit quod sicut sedebat ad prandium suum die Pentecostes subtus hayam in campo de Suburg' et cum eo Willelmus filius Vannarii et Willelmus Russel, custodes aueriorum ville de Suburg', et Rogerus Lubbe de Deneford, custos vaccarum domini, socii sui pastores, venit Willelmus de Drayton' per eos cum arcu et sagittis in vna tunica de viridi hauye; et duo alii venerunt cum eo cum arcubus et sagittis quos non nouit.

Dicit eciam quod post ipsos venit vnus homo eques super quendam equum nigrum ducentem ante eum in gremio suo vnum fetonem; et venacionem duxit subtus eum foliis coopertam.

Dicit eciam quod post ipsos venerunt duo garciones ducentes octo leporarios quorum quidam fuerunt albi, quidam teyngres [3] et quidam rubei.

Dicit eciam quod Rogerus Lubbe, custos vaccarum domini, surrexit et locutus fuit cum dictis malefactoribus et eos duxit usque Denrode.

Dicit eciam quod bene credit quod dictum Rogerus Lubbe cognouit dictos malefactores.

Willelmus filius Vannarii diligenter examinatus per se in omnibus concordat cum Henrico filio Iohannis de Suburg', socio suo, primo iurato.

Rogerus Lubbe et Willelmus Russel, iurati, nichil voluerunt cog-

[1] MS. 'equites.' [2] 10 June 1251. [3] This word is so extended in the roll.

going towards Cat's Head, and so they went into the wood of Sudborough. And on the same day John Balun and Geoffrey Hog, the walking foresters of the park, came out of Brigstock at Tot's Head, and there they found the entrails of a doe.

John Spigurnel, the riding forester, and John Balun and Geoffrey Hog and Walter Travers, walking foresters, say upon their oath that they suspect William of Drayton, and his companions, whom they do not know, of that evil deed.

Afterwards on Saturday [2] the vigil of the Holy Trinity the foresters and verderers were assembled before Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, at Acwellsike, and also the townships neighbouring thereto, to wit, Brigstock, Sudborough, Grafton with Slipton, Lowick, and Islip, to ascertain who those evil doers were, and whence they came and whither they returned.

Brigstock is sworn and knows nothing.

Sudborough is sworn and knows nothing.

Grafton is sworn and knows nothing.

Slipton is sworn and knows nothing.

Lowick and Islip are sworn and know nothing.

Henry the son of John of Sudborough, shepherd, says that as he was sitting on Whitsunday at his dinner under a hedge in the field of Sudborough, together with William the son of the winnower and William Russel, herdsmen of the beasts of the plough of the town of Sudborough, and Roger Lubbe of Denford, herdsman of the cows of the lord, his fellows, William of Drayton came past them in a tunic of green hue with a bow and arrows; and two other men, whom he did not know, came with bows and arrows.

He says also that a man mounted on a black horse came after them carrying a fawn in front of him on his lap, and he carried venison behind him covered with leaves.

He says also that two pages came after them leading eight greyhounds, of which some were white, some tawny and some red.

He says also that Roger Lubbe, the herdsman of the lord's cows got up and spoke with the said evil doers, and led them to Denrode.

He says also that he fully believes that Roger Lubbe recognised the said evil doers.

William the son of the winnower is carefully examined and agrees in all respects with Henry the son of John of Sudborough, who was first sworn.

Roger Lubbe and William Russel, are sworn and wish to acknow-

noscere, et ideo commissi fuerunt in ballium toti villate de Suburg', que eos manucepit producendos ubique ad pacem domini regis.

Dominus Iohannes de Lessington' transiuit per mediam forestam de Rokingham die [1] Veneris infra Pentecosten anno eodem, et cepit in ea duos damos et unum brokettum dami.

Henricus de Monte forti in vigilia [2] sancte Margarete anno eodem cepit vnam damam cum leporariis suis et vnum brokettum dami cum bersa in eadem foresta.

Per breue; [3] tres damos. Dominus Elias de Rabayn cepit vnum damum in parco de Brixstok' die [4] Iouis post Decollacionem sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno eodem.

Idem Elias cepit eodem die in eodem parco vnum brokettum de ceruo.

Idem Elias cepit vnum ceruum apud Hassokes die [5] Iouis proxima ante festum sancti Michaelis anno eodem.

Idem Elias cepit vnum zourum dami in Gatesle eodem die.

Dominus Galfridus de Langel' fecit capere cum mota sua in pinguedine anno eodem ad lardarium domini regis in foresta de Rokingham triginta et quatuor damos et vnum zourum cerui.

Henricus de Monte forti cepit vnum brokettum dami cum leporariis suis in vigilia [6] sancti Luce Ewangeliste anno eodem in foresta de Rokingham.

[7] Inquisicio facta apud Rotewell' die [8] Dominica proxima post festum sancti Michaelis anno eodem super capcionem vnius cerui capti inter boscum de Rowell' et boscum de Riston' die [9] Natiuitatis beate Marie anno eodem per villatas subscriptas, scilicet, Deresburg', Riston', Clendon', Rowell', Torp sub bosco et Neubotle.

Deresburg', iurata, dicit per sacramentum suum quod dominus R. de Clare, comes Glouern', fuit apud Rowell' predicto die Natiuitate beate Marie et post prandium iuit ad boscum suum de Miclewode et

[1] 9 June 1251.

[2] Wednesday, 19 July 1251.

[3] By letters close dated 28 August 1251, and addressed to the warden of the forest of Geddington, the king granted three bucks to Elias de Rabain. (Close Roll 65, m. 5.)

[4] 31 August 1251.

[5] 28 September 1251.

[6] Tuesday, 17 October 1251.

[7] See p. 34 above.

[8] 1 October 1251.

[9] 8 September 1251.

ledge nothing; and therefore they were committed on bail to the township of Sudborough, which undertakes to produce them everywhere for the peace of the lord king.

Sir John of Lessington passed through the middle of Rockingham forest on the Friday [1] in Whitsun week in the same year, and took in it two bucks and a buck's brocket.

Henry de Montfort took on the vigil [2] of St. Margaret in the same year a doe with his greyhounds, and a buck's brocket with a bercelet in the same forest.

By writ; three bucks. Sir Elias de Rabayn took a buck in Brigstock park on the Thursday [4] after the Decollation of St. John the Baptist in the same year.

The same Elias took a hart's brocket on the same day in the same park.

The same Elias took a hart at Hassokes on the Thursday [5] next before the feast of St. Michael in the same year.

The same Elias took a buck's soar in Gatesley on the same day.

Sir Geoffrey of Langley caused to be taken with his pack in the forest of Rockingham for the larder of the lord king thirty-four bucks and a hart's soar in time of grease in the same year.

Henry de Montfort took a buck's brocket with his greyhounds in the forest of Rockingham on the vigil [6] of St. Luke the Evangelist in the same year.

An inquisition was made at Rothwell on the Sunday [8] next after the feast of St. Michael in the same year upon the taking of a hart between the wood of Rothwell and the wood of Rushton on the day [9] of the Nativity of the Blessed Mary by the four underwritten townships, to wit, Desborough, Rushton, Glendon, Rothwell, Thorpe Underwood, and Newbottle.

Desborough is sworn and says upon its oath that Sir Richard of Clare, earl of Gloucester, was at Rothwell on the aforesaid day of the Nativity of the Blessed Mary, and after dinner he went into his

in eo discopulauit duos brachettos de mota sua; et inuenit vnum ceruum, qui timore canum exiuit de bosco uersus forestam, et captus fuit cum leporariis dicti comitis in campo de Deresburg' supra Rotewell'.

Dicit eciam quod predicte capcioni interfuit Henricus de Hastynges cum octo leporariis suis qui cucurrerunt.

Dicit eciam quod Robertus de Mares interfuit cum tribus leporariis suis qui cucurrerunt.

Dicit eciam quod dominus Robertus Basset interfuit cum tribus leporariis suis qui non cucurrerunt.

Dicit eciam quod dominus R. de Longo campo interfuit cum domino comite.

Dicit eciam quod Iohannes Luuet de Riston', viridarius, interfuit.

Dicit eciam quod villata de Rowell' plenarie fecit stabliam circa boscum de Rowell' quando ceruus exiuit.

Riston', iurata, in omnibus concordat cum Deresburg' primo iurata.

Clendon', iurata, in omnibus concordat cum villatis predictis, primo iuratis.

Rowell', Torp, Neubotle summonite fuerunt et non venerunt.

Viridarii dicunt quod leporarii domini Roberti Basset cucurrerunt ad ceruum et quod idem Robertus habuit vnum latus predicti cerui.

[1] Accidit die [2] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Michaelis anno eodem quod Iacobus de Thurleberg', Thomas de Ispan' et Robertus de Wik', venatores domini G. de Langel', iusticiarii foreste, et alii cum eis intrauerunt boscum de firma de Brixstok' post prandium ita quod obuiauerunt quibusdam malefactoribus in foresta cum arcubus et sagittis, per estimacionem duodecim, qui duxerunt tres canes in lieno quorum vnus fuit niger et alter ruffus cum auribus stantinis [3] et tercius tetchelatus albedine et nigredine. Venatores vero statim exclamauerunt eos et ad invicem sagittauerunt. Duo vero de malefactoribus exierunt de societate sua et ceperunt Robertum de Wik', vbi stetit ad lignum [4] suum, et cum venatores multitudini eorum obstare non potuerunt discesserunt.

Postea die [5] Sabbati proxima post festum sancti Dionisii anno

[1] See p. 32 above.
[2] 4 October 1257.
[3] The translation of this word is conjectural.
[4] This expression should be compared with 'ad fusta sua' on p. 80 above.
[5] 14 October 1257.

wood of Micklewood and uncoupled in it two braches from his pack; and he found a hart, which from fear of the hounds came out of the wood towards the forest, and was taken by the greyhounds of the said earl in the field of Desborough above Rothwell.

It says also that Henry of Hastings was present at the aforesaid taking with his eight greyhounds, which ran in pursuit.

It says also that Robert de Mares was present with his three greyhounds, which ran in pursuit.

It says also that Sir Robert Basset was present with his three greyhounds, which did not run in pursuit.

It says also that Sir Robert de Longchamp was present with the lord earl.

It says also that John Lovet of Rushton, the verderer, was present.

It says also that the township of Rothwell in large numbers beset the wood of Rothwell when the hart came out.

Rushton is sworn and in all respects agrees with Desborough, which was first sworn.

Glendon is sworn and in all things agrees with the aforesaid townships, which were first sworn.

Rothwell, Thorpe and Newbottle were summoned and did not come.

The verderers say that the greyhounds of Sir Robert Basset ran after the hart and that the same Robert had a side of the aforesaid hart.

It happened on the Wednesday [2] next after the feast of St. Michael in the same year that James of Thurlbear, Thomas of Spain, and Robert of Wick, the hunters of Sir Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest, and others with them went into the Farming wood of Brigstock after dinner and met certain persons doing evil in the forest with bows and arrows, estimated at the number of twelve, And they led three dogs in a leash, of which one was black, a second red with ears erect, and the third ticked with white and black. And the huntsmen forthwith hailed them; and they shot arrows at one another. And two of the evil doers came out of their band and seized Robert of Wick, as he stood at his tree; and when the hunters could not resist them on account of their number, they went away.

Afterwards on the Saturday [5] next after the feast of St. Denis in

eodem, conuocatis forestariis, viridariis, scilicet, dominis Mauricio Daundely, Iohanne Luuet, Ricardo de Audewincle et Hugone de Cranesl' et villatis ibidem propinquioribus, scilicet, Brixstok', Stanerne, Welledon', Benifeld', Vpthorp, Chirchefeld', Lyueden' coram domino H. de Goldingham, senescallo foreste, in claris de Welledon' apud Wrennemere ad inquirendum qui illi malefactores fuerunt et vnde venerunt et quo redierunt.

Brixstok', iurata, dixit quod bene audiuit dicere quod malefactores fuerunt eadem hora in eodem bosco; set nescit qui illi fuerunt, nec vnde nec quo redierunt.

Stanerne, iurata, dicit idem.

Welledon', iurata, dicit [idem].[1]

Benifeld' et Vpthorp, iurate, dicunt idem.

Chirchefeld', iurata, dicit idem.

Lyueden', iurata, dicit idem.

Ricardus le Harpur de Vptorp, iuratus, dicit quod bene intelligit quod Willelmus Dispensar' domini Nicholai de Bassingburn' ibi fuit, et hac racione,[2] quia eodem die obuiauit cuidam garcioni domini Nicholai venienti de bosco et portanti vnum barillum vacuum et vnum panyer' et interogauit eum vnde venit et ipse dixit quod de carpentario domini sui.

Dicit eciam quod Willelmus filius Iohannis Helle et Willelmus de Houcton', qui sunt de familia domini Nicholai de Bassingburn', ibi fuerunt.

Dicit eciam quod Robertus de Feugeres, qui solet esse valletus domini Nicholai, ibi fuit; et adhuc vadit et venit et manet in comitatu Cantebr' apud Abbyngton'.

Dicit eciam quod Colinus de Carleby in Glapthorn' et Ricardus de Pateshill' nepos eiusdem Colini in eadem villa ibi fuerunt.

Dicit eciam quod Willelmus seruiens persone de Benifeld' non fuit ibi, quia nichil scit de bosco, et quia illi de familia domini Nicholai ipsum odio habent et ipse nunquam associatus fuit eis.

Dicit eciam quod Alanus Cut non fuit cum eis nec tunc nec alias, quia non est associatus eis.

Dicit eciam quod Radulfus de Susex' et Robertus de Ardern', forestarii, non fuerunt ibi quia eodem die visi fuerunt in villa de Brixstok' ad altam nonam; et post prandium, quando venatores obuiauerunt malefactoribus, visi fuerunt apud Stanerne ad domum domini Henrici de Den et ibi pernoctauerunt; et hoc testificatum fuit

[1] This word is omitted in the MS.

[2] His reason is not very conclusive, but his statement is probably not fully enrolled.

the same year, the foresters and verderers, to wit, Sirs Maurice Daundelay, John Lovet, Richard of Aldwinkle, and Hugh of Cransley, and the townships neighbouring thereto, to wit, Brigstock, Stanion, Weldon, Benefield, Upthorp, Churchfield and Lyveden, were assembled before Sir Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, in the clearing of Weldon at Wrennemere, to ascertain who those evil doers were, and whence they came, and whither they returned.

Brigstock was sworn and said that full well it had heard it said that evil doers were in the forest at the same hour and in the same wood; but it does not know who they were, nor whence they came, nor whither they returned.

Stanion is sworn and says the same.

Weldon is sworn and says the same.

Benefield and Upthorp are sworn and say the same.

Churchfield is sworn and says the same.

Lyveden is sworn and says the same.

Richard the Harper of Upthorp is sworn and says that he well understands that William the spenser of Sir Nicholas of Bassingbourn was there, and for this reason because on the same day, he met a certain page of Sir Nicholas coming from the wood and carrying an empty barrel and a basket; and he asked him whence he came; and he said that he came from the carpenter of his lord.

He says also that William the son of John Helle and William of Houghton, who are of the household of Sir Nicholas of Bassingbourn, were there.

He says also that Robert de Feugères, who used to be the yeoman of Sir Nicholas, was there; and he still goes to and fro, and dwells in the country of Cambridge, at Abingdon.

He says also that Colin of Carlby in Glapthorn and Richard of Pattishall, the nephew of the same Colin in the same town, were there.

He says also that William, the servant of the parson of Benefield, was not there, because he knows nothing of the wood, and because the men of the household of Sir Nicholas hold him in hatred, and he was never associated to them.

He says also that Alan Cut was not there with them neither then nor at any other time, because he is not associated to them.

He says also that Ralph of Sussex and Robert of Ardern, the foresters, were not there, because they were seen on the same day at full noon in the town of Brigstock; and after dinner when the huntsmen met the evil doers they were seen at Stanion at the house of Sir Henry of Deene, and they spent the night there. And this was

per viridarios et per omnes villatas per sacramentum suum. Et Ricardus de Audewincl', viridarius, dicit per sacramentum suum quod illi duo forestarii fuerunt cum eo eodem die a mane usque ad nonam.

Dicit eciam quod vigilia [1] Exaltacionis sancte Crucis anno regni regis tricesimo quarto iuit in bosco querere porcos suos et obuiauit Willelmo Despens' et salutauit eum.

Et Willelmus respondit :—'Non saluto te.'

'Quare?'

'Quia furasti damum nostrum.'

'Non certe,' dixit.

'Ricarde, ego mallem ire ad carucam meam quam seruire de tali officio.'

Et postea quesitus fuit ille damus et inuentus fuit salatus in domo Hugonis Iustise de Vpthorp, hominis domini Nicholai, et ipse quando sciuit, tantum distrinxit dictum Hugonem quod reddidit ei dictum damum.

Hugo de Goldingham, senescallus foreste, et forestarii et viridarii statim processerunt apud Benifeld' et cerchiauerunt domos domini Nicholai de Bassingburn' et nichil inuenerunt de malefacto foreste; set Robertus de Wik' dixit quod vidit in eadem curia illos duos malefactores qui eum ceperunt ad lignum [2] suum, scilicet, Willelmum de Houtton' et Iohannem filium Ricardi prepositi de Lilleford'.

Iohannes Luuet, viridarius, et quidam forestarius cum eo processerunt apud Glapthorn et cerchiauerunt domum Nicolai [3] de Carleby, et inuenerunt in ea vnum arcum cum corda et viginti sagittas walenses et glandem per estimacionem dimidii quarterii.

Arcus et sagitte remanserunt [4] in manibus Iohannis Luuet, viridarii, ad tenendum coram iusticiariis.

Plegii Willelmi Dispen' respondendi coram iusticiariis itinerantibus de foresta. . . . [5]

Plegii Willelmi de Houtton' :—Robertus filius Rogeri, Henricus Faber, Galfridus Megr', Robertus Kydenot, Henricus Kyte, Iordanus de Vpthorp', Willelmus filius prepositi, Hugo filius Matilde, Robertus filius Inge, Walterus [6] filius Alani, Benedictus Sutor et Robertus Maydyn. . . . .

Plegii Hugonis Iustis' [5]. . .

Plegii Willelmi Helle [5]. . .

Plegii Iohannis filii Ricardi prepositi de Lilleford' [5]. . .

[1] Tuesday, 13 September 1250.

[2] See note 4, p. 99 above.

[3] He is called Colinus on p. 34 above.

[4] MS. 'remiserunt.'

[5] Twelve names.

[6] He is called Willelmus on p. 34 above.

witnessed by the verderers and by all the townships upon their oath. And Richard of Aldwinkle, the verderer, says upon his oath that those two foresters were with him on the same day from morn till noon.

He says also that on the vigil[1] of the Exaltation of the Holy Cross in the thirty-fourth year of the reign of the king he went into the wood to seek his pigs; and he met William the spenser and greeted him.

And William replied: 'I do not greet you.'

'Why not?'

'Because you stole our buck.'

'Certainly not,' he said.

'Richard! I would rather go to my plough than serve in such an office as yours.'

And afterwards that buck was sought, and found salted in the house of Hugh Justice of Upthorp, the man of Sir Nicholas; and he, when he knew it, distrained the said Hugh so much that he returned the said buck to him.

Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, and the foresters and verderers forthwith proceeded to Benefield, and searched the houses of Sir Nicholas of Bassingbourn, and they found no tokens of evil deeds to the venison. But Robert of Wick said that he saw in the same court the two evil doers who took him to their tree, to wit, William of Houghton and John the son of Richard of Lilford.

John Lovet, the verderer, and a certain forester with him, proceeded to Glapthorn and searched the house of Nicholas of Carlby; and they found in it a bow with a string, and twenty Welsh arrows, and mast estimated at half a quarter.

The bow and the arrows remained in the hands of John Lovet, the verderer, to produce before the justices.

Pledges of William the spenser, answering before the justices in eyre of the forest . . .

Pledges of William of Houghton, Robert the son of Roger, Henry the smith, Geoffrey Meagre, Robert Kydenot, Henry Kyte, Jordan of Upthorp, William the son of the reeve, Hugh the son of Maud, Robert the son of Inge, Walter the son of Alan, Bennet the cobbler and Robert Mayden.

Pledges of Hugh Justice . . .

Pledges of William Helle . . .

Pledges of John, the son of Richard the reeve of Lilford . . .

Plegii Radulfi de Susex'[1]. . .
Plegii Alani Cut[2]. . .
Plegii Robertus de Ardern'[2]. . .
Plegii Colini de Carleby in Glapthorn[2]. . .
Plegii Ricardi de Pateshill' in eadem[2]. . .

Iohannes Spigurnel, forestarius eques de parco de Brixstok', presentauit quod sicut venit de swanimoto de Stanerne die[3] Mercurii proxima ante festum sancti Michaelis, et cum eo Robertus Page, custos de Acwellesyke, viderunt in Gatesle duos malefactores foreste cum arcubus et sagittis qui tractauerunt ad eos tres sagittas; et iuerunt uersus spissum de Aybriotheshawe; vnde dicunt per sacramentum suum quod vnus illorum duorum fuit Dawe filius Mabille de Suburg' et alius habuit vnam viseriam super capud suum vnde suspeccionem habuerunt quod ille fuit Willelmus de Drayton' et eo maiore, quia alias rettatus fuit de malefacto in foresta. Dictus Willelmus de Drayton' cum nullo est assidue, set aliquando hic, aliquando illuc. Et ideo predictus Dawe atachiatus fuit et inuenit duodecim plegios respondendi coram iusticiariis, scilicet[2]. . . .

Anno tricesimo sexto. Henricus de Monte forti cepit duas damas in landa de Banefeld' cum leporariis suis die[4] Mercurii proxima post Ephifaniam anno regni regis Henrici tricesimo sexto.

Dominus rex venit apud Geytington' die[5] Iouis proxima post festum sancti Hillarii anno eodem, et regina similiter; et perhendinauerunt usque diem[6] Martis proximam sequentem et ceperunt venacionem ad voluntatem suam in foresta.

Per breue;[7] tres damas. Dominus Iohannes de Plessiz, comes Warwik', cepit vnam damam in Bulex cum leporariis suis die[8] Mercurii in vigilia Conuersionis sancti Pauly anno eodem.

Idem comes cepit vnum brokettum dami in vigilia[9] Purificacionis beate Marie in eodem bosco.

Idem comes cepit vnam damam et vnum brokettum dami et vnum fetonem in eodem bosco in crastino[10] sancte Katherine virginis cum leporariis suis.

[1] Ten names.
[2] Twelve names. [3] 25 September 1251.
[4] 10 January $125\frac{1}{2}$.
[5] 18 January $125\frac{1}{2}$.
[6] 23 January $125\frac{1}{2}$.
[7] By letters close dated 5 January $125\frac{1}{2}$ the king granted to the Earl of Warwick three does. Close Roll 66, m. 27.
[8] 24 January $125\frac{1}{2}$.
[9] Thursday, 1 February $125\frac{1}{2}$.
[10] Sunday, 26 November 1251.

Pledges of Ralph of Sussex . . .
Pledges of Alan Cut . . .
Pledges of Robert of Ardern . . .
Pledges of Colin of Carlby in Glapthorn . . .
Pledges of Richard of Pattishall . . .

John Spigurnel, the riding forester of Brigstock park, presented that as he came from the swanimote of Stanion on the Wednesday[3] next before the feast of St. Michael together with Robert Page, the keeper of Acwellsike, they saw two evil doers to the forest with bows and arrows, who shot three arrows at them; and they went towards the thicket of Aybriotheshawe. And they say upon their oath that one of those two evil doers was Dawe, the son of Mabel of Sudborough; and that the other had a mask over his head, wherefore they suspected that he was William of Drayton, and more especially because he was accused before of an evil deed in the forest. The said William of Drayton is with no one constantly, and is sometimes in one place and sometimes another. And therefore the aforesaid Dawe was attached, and he found twelve pledges of making answer before the justices, to wit . . . .

In the thirty-sixth year. Henry de Montfort took two does in Beanfield lawn with his greyhounds on the Wednesday[4] next after the Epiphany in the thirty-sixth year of the reign of king Henry.

The lord king came to Geddington on the Thursday[5] next after the feast of St. Hilary in the same year; and the queen also. And they tarried there till the Tuesday[6] next following; and they took venison in the forest at their pleasure.

By writ; three does. Sir John du Plessis, earl of Warwick, took a doe in Bulax with his greyhounds on Wednesday, the vigil[8] of the Conversion of St. Paul in the same year.

The same earl took a buck's brocket on the vigil[9] of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the same wood.

The same earl took a doe and a buck's brocket and a fawn with his greyhounds in the same wood on the morrow[10] of St. Katharine the virgin.

[1] In crastino [2] Conuersionis sancti Pauli homines magistri Paulini [3] et Petri de Stanford', scilicet, Petrus de Froggemor et Iohannes de Sumerset' ceperunt duas damas et vnum fetonem in Hassokes cum leporariis suis anno eodem.

Inquisicio [4] facta die [5] Veneris proxima post Conuersionem sancti Pauli anno eodem sub parco de Stok' proprius [6] la Merehecke super capcionem vnius fere domini regis capte, per quatuor villatas, scilicet, Stok', Wilberdeston', Brampton', Deresburg', coram Iohanne Luuet, viridario, et forestariis iuratis.

Stok', iurata, dicit quod Thomas filius Simonis de Nauesby de Brampton', hostiarius de capella domini regis, venit apud Brampton', et quidam clericus francus de elemosinaria domini regis cum eo, die [7] Dominica proxima ante festum sancti Vincencii videre patrem suum qui infirmabatur et languidus fuit, et ea nocte cum dicto Simone hospitabantur. Dictus clericus francus cum eo duxit quinque leporarios duos fauos duos ruffos et vnum nigrum coueire. Mane illinc recessit dictus clericus francus cum leporariis predictis et illum habet suspectum de capcione illius bestie et non alium, quia dictus Thomas filius Simonis cum patre suo remansit.

Wilb', iurata, dicit idem.

Brampton,' iurata, dicit idem et in omnibus concordat predictis villatis.

Deresburg', iurata, dicit idem.

Petrus Coleuill' et Ricardus Coleuill' manucapiunt villatas de Stok' et Wilberdeston' essendi inde coram iusticiariis.

Thomas Seruiens et Thomas de Dyngel' manucapiunt villatam de Brampton' essendi coram iusticiariis.

Norman Kynton' et Willelmus filius Simonis manucapiunt villatam de Deresburg' essendi coram iusticiariis.

Iacobus de Turleberg' et Robertus de Wik', vallecti domini G. de Langel', iusticiarii foreste, ceperunt quatuor cheuerellos ad opus

[1] See p. 34 above.

[2] Friday, 26 January 125½.

[3] This and the following word were probably inserted in error. In the eyre roll John of Somerset only is described as being with Peter of Stamford.

[4] See p. 34 above.

[5] 26 January 125½.

[6] The true reading of this word is very doubtful.

[7] 21 January, 125½.

On the morrow[2] of the Conversion of St. Paul in the same year, the men of master Peter of Stamford, to wit, Peter of Frogmore and John of Somerset, took two does and a fawn with their greyhounds in Hassokes.

An inquisition was made on the Friday[5] next after the Conversion of St. Paul at the park of Stoke near le Merehecke, by four townships, to wit, Stoke, Wilbarston, Brampton and Desborough, before John Lovet, the verderer, and the sworn foresters, upon the taking of a deer belonging to the lord king.

Stoke is sworn and says that Thomas the son of Simon of Naseby of Brampton, the usher of the king's chapel, accompanied by a certain free clerk of the king's almonry came to Brampton on the Sunday[7] next before the feast of St. Vincent to see his father, who was worn out and sick; and on that night they lodged with the same Simon. The said free clerk who accompanied him brought five greyhounds, two fallow, two red, and one black brindled. In the morning the said free clerk withdrew from his lodging with the aforesaid greyhounds; and it suspects him of taking that beast and no one else, because the said Thomas the son of Simon remained with his father.

Wilbarston is sworn and says the same.

Brampton is sworn and says the same, and in all things agrees with the aforesaid townships.

Desborough is sworn and says the same.

Peter Colleville and Richard Colleville are mainperners of the townships of Stoke and Wilbarston being before the justices concerning this matter.

Thomas the Serjeant and Thomas of Dingley are mainperners of the township of Brampton being before the justices.

Norman Kynton and William the son of Simon are mainperners of the township of Desborough being before the justices.

James of Thurlbear and Robert of Wick, the yeomen of Sir Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest, took four roes in the

domini Edwardi filii regis die Martis et die[1] Mercurii proximis post Purificacionem beate Marie anno eodem in foresta de Rokingham.

Per breue. Rogerus de Ferr' cepit in foresta de Rokingham quindecim damas et quinque damos viuos ad opus domini Willelmi de Ferr', comitis Derb', ad quemdam parcum instaurandum de dono[2] domini regis in Marcio anno eodem, et vnum fetonem mortuum cepit eodem tempore.

Accidit die[3] Veneris proxima post festum apostolorum Petri et Pauli anno eodem quod dominus Mauricius Daundely, viridarius, venit apud Grafton' ad domum Willelmi de la Bruere et inuenit ibi duos leporarios et inquisiuit cuius fuerunt, et dictum fuit ei quod fuerunt Iohannis Cardun. Predictus Mauricius cepit dictos leporarios et eos liberauit Iohanni Spigurnel, forestario equiti de parco, et athachiauit predictum Iohannem Cardun respondendi coram iusticiariis. Eius plegii' . . . .[4]

Predicti duo leporarii commissi fuerunt domino G. de Langel', iusticiario foreste.

Dominus R. comes Cornub' cepit in parco de Brixstok' die[5] Lune in crastino Translacionis sancti Thome martiris anno eodem quinque damos; et die Martis proxima sequenti in eodem parco tres damos.

Idem comes cepit die[6] Mercurii proxima sequenti in balliua de Rokingh' nouem damos et in balliua de parco duos damos.

Idem comes cepit die[7] Iouis proxima sequenti in balliua de Rokingham vnum ceruum et duos damos.

Idem comes cepit in parco die[8] Mercurii ante festum sancte Margarete vnum damum; et die Iouis proxima sequenti in eodem parco quatuor damos, et in balliua de firma quinque damos.

Dominus Stephanus de Feuger' cepit vnam damam cum leporariis suis in Driffeld' die[9] Martis proxima ante festum sancti Petri ad Vincula anno eodem.

[1] 6, 7 February 125½.

[2] By letters close dated 22 February 125½. See Close Roll 66, memb. 23.

[3] 5 July 1252.

[4] Six names.

[5] 8 July 1252.

[6] 10 July 1252.

[7] 11 July 1252.

[8] 17 July 1252.

[9] 30 July 1252.

forest of Rockingham for the use of Sir Edward, the king's son, on the Tuesday and Wednesday [1] next after the Purification of the Blessed Mary.

By writ. Roger de Ferrières took fifteen live does and five live bucks in the forest of Rockingham in March in the same year for the use of Sir William de Ferrières, earl of Derby, for stocking his park, of the gift of the lord king; and he took a dead fawn at the same time.

It happened on the Friday [3] next before the feast of the Apostles Peter and Paul in the same year that Sir Maurice Daundelay, the verderer, came to Grafton to the house of William de la Bruere, and found there two greyhounds. And he inquired whose they were, and was told that they belonged to John Cardun. The aforesaid Maurice took the said greyhounds and delivered them to John Spigurnel, the riding forester of the park, and he attached the aforesaid John Cardun to make answer before the justices. His pledges were . . . .

The aforesaid two greyhounds were sent to Sir Geoffrey of Langley, the justice of the forest.

Sir Richard, earl of Cornwall, took five bucks in the park of Brigstock on Monday [5] the morrow of the Translation of St. Thomas the Martyr in the same year; and three bucks in the same park on the Tuesday next following.

The same earl took nine bucks in the bailiwick of Rockingham and two bucks in the bailiwick of the park on the Wednesday [6] next following.

The same earl took a hart and two bucks in the bailiwick of Rockingham on the Thursday [7] next following.

The same earl took one buck in the park on the Wednesday [8] before the feast of St. Margaret; and four bucks in the same park on the Thursday next following, and five bucks in the Farming bailiwick.

Sir Stephen de Feugères took a doe with his greyhounds in Driffield on the Tuesday [9] next before the feast of St. Peter's Chains in the same year.

Per breue. Abbas de Burg' sancti Petri fecit capere in foresta de Rokingh' in Augusto anno eodem tres damos et vnum broketum dami de dono domini regis.

Per breue. Dominus Willelmus de Wasteneys cepit eodem tempore ad opus domini Gileberti de Segraue duos damos de dono[1] domini regis in eadem foresta.

Abbas Westm' cepit in eadem foresta vnum zourum cerui cum leporariis suis die[2] Sabbati proxima post Decollacionem sancti Iohannis Baptiste anno eodem.

Per breue. Idem abbas cepit vnum damum in Bulex die[3] Martis proxima post Natiuitatem sancte Marie anno eodem.

Per breue. Venatores domini Willelmi de Valenc' ceperunt eodem tempore in eadem foresta vnum damum de dono domini regis.

Per breue. Dominus Robertus Basset cepit in eadem foresta eodem tempore in pinguedine duos damos ad opus magistri Willelmi de Kilkenny, archidiaconi Couentr', de dono[4] domini regis.

Anno tricesimo septimo. Inquisicio facta ad molendinum extra Wodeford' die[5] Sabbati in festo sancti Clementis anno regni regis Henrici tricesimo septimo coram domino Mauricio Daundely et Ricardo de Audewincl', viridariis, et Iohanne Spigurnel, forestario, per quatuor villatas Wodeford', Islep', Twiwell', Slipton', Adington' et Irtlingburg' que, iurate, dicunt per sacramentum suum quod homines comitis de Ferr' die[6] sancti Edmundi de Pontania fugauerunt vnum brokettum dami infra libertatem usque ad aquam[7] subtus Wodeford'. Et brokettus ibi transiuit aquam et resistit in quodam butimine extra Wodeford', et ibi custoditus fuit per villatam quousque Ricardus de Audewincle, viridarius, venit et per ipsum et per villatam ductus fuit ad forestam saluus et sanus.

Per breue. Edmundus de Lascy cepit in balliua de firma de Brixstok' die[8] Martis proxima ante festum sancti Valentini anno eodem

[1] The king granted three bucks to Gilbert of Seagrave by letters close dated 4 August 1252. See Close Roll 66, m. 8.

[2] 31 August 1252.

[3] 10 September 1252.

[4] By letters close, dated 24 August 1252. See Close Roll 66, m. 5.

[5] 23 November 1252.

[6] Edmund, Archbishop of Canterbury, died at Soissy on 16 November 1240, and was buried at Pontigny on 18 November 1240.

[7] The water mentioned was the river Nen, which at this time was one of the boundaries of the forest of Rockingham.

[8] 11 February $125\frac{2}{3}$.

By writ. The abbot of Peterborough caused three bucks and a buck's brocket to be taken in the forest of Rockingham in August in the same year of the gift of the lord king.

By writ. Sir William de Wasteneys took two bucks at the same time for the use of Sir Gilbert of Seagrave of the gift of the lord king.

The abbot of Westminster took a hart's soar with his greyhounds in the same forest on the Saturday [2] next after the Decollation of St. John the Baptist in the same year.

By writ. The same abbot took a buck in Bulax on the Tuesday [3] next after the Nativity of the Blessed Mary in the same year.

By writ. The hunters of Sir William de Valence took a buck in the same forest at the same time, of the gift of the lord king.

By writ. Sir Robert Basset took two bucks in the same forest in time of grease for the use of Master William of Kilkenny, archdeacon of Coventry, of the gift of the lord king.

In the thirty-seventh year. An inquisition was made at the mill outside Woodford, on Saturday [5] the feast of St. Clement in the thirty-seventh year of the reign of king Henry, before Sir Maurice Daundelay and Richard of Aldwinkle, the verderers, and John Spigurnel, the forester, by four townships, Woodford, Islip, Twywell, Slipton, Addington, and Irtlingborough, who, being sworn, say upon their oath that the men of the Earl de Ferrières hunted on the day of St. Edmund of Pontigny a buck's brocket from within the liberty as far as the water beneath Woodford. And the brocket there crossed the water and stood in a certain swamp outside Woodford; and it was kept there by the township until Richard of Aldwinkle, the verderer, came, and by him and the township it was brought into the forest safe and sound.

By writ. Edmund de Lassy took with his greyhounds in the bailiwick of Brigstock Farming on the Tuesday [8] next before the feast

vnam damam et vnum fetonem dami masculinum vnius anni cum leporariis suis de dono domini regis.

Per breue. Magister Simon de Wauton' fecit capere in foresta de Rokingham in Februario anno eodem octo damas et quatuor damos viuos de dono [1] domini regis ad parcum suum instaurandum. Et vnus capriolus vlterius.

Per breue. Dominus Robertus Basset cepit in eadem foresta duas damas ad opus uxoris domini Roberti de Mares' die [2] Mercurii proxima post festum sancti Mathie apostoli anno eodem de dono [3] domini regis.

[4] Accidit die [5] Martis proxima ante Dominicam Palmarum anno eodem infra noctem quod Willelmus de Rode, forestarius pedites [6] de parco, venit in villa de Brixstok' ita quod obuiauit Galfrido Catel de eadem et Petro Welp intrantibus villam. Et Galfridus tulit vnam damam integram wlneratam per medium capud cum quadam sagitta. Et dictus Willelmus cepit dictum Galfridum et interogauit eum, ubi habuit dictam damam; et ipse dixit quod venit in parco apud Hassok' eodem die et inuenit dictam damam mortuam in caua quercu, et traxit illam in quendam dumetum, et accessit ad villam de Brixstok' et obuiauit Iohanni Prentut, forestario equiti, et Colino de Geytington', forestario pediti, et Thome Stule, garcioni Iohannis Prentut, et Petro Welp, qui perceperunt super eum pilum bestialem. Et interogauerunt eum vnde ille pilus fuit. Et ipse dixit quod inuenit vnam damam mortuam in parco et eam abscondit. Et ipsi promiserunt ei quod nunquam haberet inde malum, condicione, quod reduceret eos ad damam predictam. Et ipse retornauit ducens eos ad damam. Et ipsi preceperunt [7] ei ferre predictam damam ad domum Petri Welp in Brixstok' et promiserunt ei spaulas et collum.

Postea die [8] Iouis proxima sequenti, conuocatis forestariis viridariis et quatuor villatis, scilicet, Brixstok', Stanerne, Grafton' et Suburg' apud Brixtok', ad inquisicionem super hoc faciendam.

Brixstok', iurata, dicit per sacramentum suum quod bene sciunt quod dictus Galfridus inuenit predictam damam mortuam set nesciunt quis eam occidit, et quod dictus Galfridus voluit tulisse eam ad domum suam propriam et non ad domum Petri Welp. Et dicunt per sacramentum suum quod bene sciunt quod totum falsum esset quicquid

[1] By letters close dated 27 December 1252, addressed to Hugh of Goldingham, who is described in them as steward of the forest of Rockingham. See Close Roll 67, m. 21.

[2] 26 February 125$\frac{2}{3}$.

[3] By letters close dated 15 February 125$\frac{2}{3}$. See Close Roll 67, m. 17.

[4] See p. 35 above.

[5] 8 April 1253.

[6] The first five letters only of this word are written in the manuscript. Its usual form is 'pedes.'

[7] MS. 'precipuerunt.'

[8] 10 April 1253.

of St. Valentine in the same year, a doe and a male fawn of a buck, a year old, of the gift of the lord king.

By writ. Master Simon of Walton caused eight live does and four live bucks to be taken in the forest of Rockingham, of the gift of the lord king, to stock his park. And one roe besides.

By writ. Sir Robert Basset took two does in the same forest on the Wednesday[2] next before the feast of St. Mathias the apostle in the same year for the use of the wife of Sir Robert de Mares, of the gift of the lord king.

It happened on the Tuesday[5] next before Palm Sunday in the same year at night time that William of Rode, the walking forester of the park, came into the town of Brigstock and so met Geoffrey Catel of the same town and Peter Welp entering the town. And Geoffrey carried a whole doe which had been wounded in the middle of the head with a certain arrow. And the said William took the said Geoffrey and asked him whence he had the said doe. And he said that he went into the park at Hassokes on the same day and found the said doe dead in a hollow oak, and he dragged it to a certain thicket. And he went to the town of Brigstock and there met John Prentut, the riding forester, and Colin of Geddington, the walking forester, and Thomas Stule, the page of John Prentut, and Peter Welp, who perceived on him deer's hair. And they asked him whence that hair came. And he said that he found a dead doe in the park and hid it. And they promised him that he should suffer no harm thereby on condition that he brought them back to the said doe. And he returned leading them to the doe. And they bade him bring the aforesaid doe to the house of Peter Welp in Brigstock. And they promised him the shoulders and neck.

Afterwards on the Thursday[8] next following the foresters, verderers and four townships, to wit, Brigstock, Stanion, Grafton and Sudborough were assembled at Brigstock to make an inquisition thereupon.

Brigstock is sworn and says upon its oath that they know well that the said Geoffrey found the aforesaid doe already dead, but they know not who killed it; and that the said Geoffrey wished to bring it to his own house and not to the house of Peter Welp. And they say upon their oath that they know well that everything was false with which

inponebat forestariis et Petro Welp. Et bene sciunt quod Petrus Welp venit de ceruisia eadem hora ante Willelmus cepit eundem Galfridum. Et nullam suspeccionem habent uersus aliquem uel aliquos de malefacto predicto nisi versus eundem Galfridum qui captus est.

Stanerne, iurata, dicit idem.

Grafton', iurata, dicit idem.

Suburg', iurata, dicit idem.

Dominus Mauricius Daundely, viridarius, dixit quod predicti forestarii comederunt eodem die Martis cum Radulfo de Craneford' apud Craneford et fuerunt ad domum suam usque ad occasum solis.

Dictus Galfridus dedixit etc. coram quatuor viridariis et quatuor villatis quicquid prius dixerat coram senescallo et forestariis et quatuor viridariis; et dixit quod Willelmus de Rode, qui eum cepit, fecit eum per vim dicere hoc quod dixit super forestarios et Petrum Welp.

Dictus Galfridus commissus fuit ad prisonam Norhampt'; tunc vicecomes dominus[1] Willelmus de Insula.

Catalla eius capta fuerunt in manu domini regis, videlicet, due parue bouette femelle, et quatuor oues matrices tondentes, et quatuor iuuenes agni, toti de precio iiij s., et vna vetus tina, et due veteres corbelles de precio ij d. Et commissa fuerunt toti villate ut respondeant de precio coram iusticiariis.

Coreus dami commissus fuit Geroudo filio Roberti de Suburg' in Brixstok' ad tenendum coram iusticiariis.

Caro data fuit leprosis pro anima domini regis.

Tamen propter suspeccionem Iohannes Prentut inuenit plegios de veniendo coram iusticiariis, scilicet[2]:—. . . .

Colinus de Geytington' inuenit plegios de veniendo coram iusticiariis, scilicet[2]:—. . . .

Petrus Welp inuenit plegios de veniendo coram iusticiariis, scilicet[2]:—. . . .

Iohannes Prentut manucepit Thomam Stule, garcionem suum, de producendo ipsum ubique.

Tresdecim porci inuenti fuerunt apud Brixstok' qui fuerunt Radulfi de Brixstok,' qui rettatus fuit pro malefacto cum retibus in foresta de Witlewod'. Et preciati fuerunt per quatuor viridarios quilibet pro sex denariis et liberati fuerunt Henrico preposito et Roberto Neubond' ut respondeant de precio eorum coram iusticiariis.

[1] William de l'Isle seems to have been sheriff of Northampton from 23 April 1252 till 13 June 1253. See *List of Sheriffs*.

[2] Twelve names.

he charged the foresters and Peter Welp. And they know well that Peter Welp came from an ale gathering at the same hour, which was before William took the same Geoffrey. And they suspect no other person or persons of the aforesaid evil deed, except only the same Geoffrey, who is taken.

Stanion is sworn and says the same.

Grafton is sworn and says the same.

Sudborough is sworn and says the same.

Sir Maurice Daundelay, the verderer, said that the aforesaid foresters dined on the same Tuesday with Ralph of Cranford at Cranford, and were at his house until sunset.

The said Geoffrey denied etc. before the four verderers and four townships all that he had previously said before the steward and the foresters and the four verderers, and said that William of Rode, who took him, by means of force made him say what he said about the foresters and Peter Welp.

The said Geoffrey was committed to the prison of Northampton; the sheriff was then Sir William de l'Isle.

His chattels were taken into the hand of the lord king, to wit, two small heifers, and four shearling ewes and four young lambs, all of them together of the price of four shillings, and an old bowl and two old baskets of the price of three pence. And they were given to the whole township to answer for the price before the justices.

The skin of the buck was given to Gerald the son of Robert of Sudborough of Brigstock, to produce before the justices.

The flesh was given to the lepers for the soul of the lord king.

Nevertheless on account of suspicion John Prentut found pledges of coming before the justices, to wit . . . .

Colin of Geddington found pledges of coming before the justices, to wit . . . .

Peter Welp found pledges of coming before the justices, to wit . . . .

John Prentut was the mainperner of Thomas Stule, his page, for producing him wheresoever etc.

Thirteen pigs were found at Brigstock. They belonged to Ralph of Brigstock, who was suspected of an evil deed with nets in the forest of Whittlewood. And they were appraised by the four verderers at sixpence each; and were given to Henry the reeve and Robert Newbond to answer for their price before the justices.

Iohannes de Plesset', comes Warwik', cepit die[1] Martis ante Ascensionem anno eodem vnum damum et vnum zourum dami et vnam damam in parco apud Acwellesik'.

[2] Rogerus de Tineswich presentauit quod Iohannes Balun et Henricus de Chirchefeld' et Thomas de Pilketon' sunt malefactores de venacione domini regis; et Robertus persona de Trapston' eos receptauit. Inquisicio facta super hoc apud Lufwyc die[3] Veneris proxima ante festum Purificacionis beate Marie anno tricesimo octauo coram viridariis et forestariis per quatuor villatas subscriptas, scilicet, per Audewincl', Lufwyc', Yslep, Sutburg'.

Audewincle, iurata, dicit quod predicti forestarii sunt fideles in seruicio domini regis, et nichil sciunt de illis nisi fidelitatem, nec de illis aliquam habent susspeccionem.

Lufwyc, Yslep, Sutburg', iurate, concordant cum Audewincle, primo iurata.

Memorandum quod H. de Goldingh' recepit senescaciam[4] foreste die[5] Martis proxima ante festum Assumpcionis beate Marie anno tricesimo septimo.

Dominus Ricardus, comes Cornub', cepit in parco de Brixstok' die[6] Lune et die[6] Martis proximis post Assumpcionem beate Marie anno tricesimo septimo tres damos.

Robertus Basset cepit in foresta de Rokingham in Augusto anno eodem ad opus magistri Willelmi de Kilkenny quatuor damos, vnde Ricardus de Walton, tunc forestarius et constabularius de Rokingh', habet breue.

Galfridus de Childevic habuit breue.

Inquisicio facta apud Corby die[7] Iouis post festum sancti Michaelis anno eodem coram domino E. de Bosco,[8] iusticiario foreste, super malefactoribus in foresta per hos subscriptos:—

Willelmus de Musca, miles.	Iohannes de Bray de Pilket'.
Willelmus filius Andree de Lyueden'.	Robertus filius Willelmi de Lufwic.
Willelmus de Camera.	Robertus filius Henrici de Stok'.

[1] 27 May 1253.

[2] This entry is written on a schedule to the original roll. [3] 30 January 125$\frac{3}{4}$.

[4] Hugh of Goldingham was not appointed warden of the forests between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford until 6 March 125$\frac{4}{5}$ (p. 11, note 7 above). By the office of steward the deputy wardenship was probably intended. It should be noticed that he has already been described as steward in inquisitions of an earlier date (see pp. 95, 96 above).

[5] 12 August 1253. [6] 18, 19 August 1253.

[7] 2 October 1253. [8] See p. 15, note 3 above.

John du Plessis, earl of Warwick, took a buck, and a buck's soar and a doe on the Tuesday [1] before Ascension day in the same year in the park at Acwellsike.

Roger of Tingewick presented that John Balun and Henry of Churchfield and Thomas of Pilton are evil doers to the venison of the lord king; and Robert the parson of Thrapston harboured them. An inquisition was made thereupon at Lowick on the Friday [3] next before the feast of the Purification of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-eighth year before the verderers and foresters by the four underwritten townships, to wit, by Aldwinkle, Lowick, Islip, and Sudborough.

Aldwinkle is sworn and says that the aforesaid foresters are faithful in the service of the lord king; and they know nothing of them except that they are faithful; and they have no suspicion concerning them.

Lowick, Islip, and Sudborough are sworn and agree in all things with Aldwinkle, which was first sworn.

Be it remembered that Hugh of Goldingham received the office of steward of the forest on the Tuesday [5] next before the feast of the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-seventh year.

Sir Richard, earl of Cornwall, took three bucks in the park of Brigstock on the Monday [6] and Tuesday [6] next after the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-seventh year.

Robert Basset took four bucks in the forest of Rockingham for the use of Master William of Kilkenny in August in the same year. And Richard of Walton who was then forester and constable of Rockingham has the writ.

An inquisition concerning evil doers in the forest was made at Corby on the Thursday [7] after the feast of St. Michael in the same year before Sir Arnold de Bois, justice of the forest, by the underwritten persons:—

William de la Mouche, knight.
William the son of Andrew of Lyveden.
William of the chamber.
John of Bray of Pilton.
Robert the son of William of Lowick.
Robert the son of Henry of Stoke.

Elias de Stanerne.
Radulfus Piccor de Islep'.
Willelmus filius Ricardi extra uillam.
Henricus Iocehom' de eadem.
Laurencius Frankeleyn de Welledon'.
Willelmus filius Roberti de eadem.
Willelmus de Twiwell' in Stanerne.

Villate:—Geytington', Acle, Bricstok', Corby, Stanerne, iurate.

[1] Qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod habent suspeccionem quod Henricus Neue natus de Islep' per tres annos elapsos iuit cum arcubus et sagittis in parco de Brixtok' et in bosco de firma.

Et Salomon de Acle insimul malefactor in eisdem boscis cum arcubus et sagittis; et se aduocat per dominum Hugonem de Goldingh', senescallum foreste. Et dicunt quod idem Salomon est consenciens omnibus architenentibus, qui venerunt in eisdem boscis ad malefaciendum de venacione domini regis; et associatus est eis.

Item dicunt quod Simon filius Rogeri de Geytington' vadit cum arcu et sagittis barbatis in parco de Brixstok'; et non est forestarius iuratus, per quod habent suspeccionem quod malefactor est de venacione domini regis et consenciens est omnibus malefactoribus in eodem parco; et se aduocat per Iohannem Spigurnel; et ideo inuenit plegios respondendi coram iusticiariis, scilicet, Colinum filium Willelmi filii Fulconis de Geytingt' et Ricardum de Horton' de eadem.

Memorandum quod predictus Salomon obuiauit illis qui predauerunt carettam ad crucem de Lappeworth' in foresta de Geytington' et cognouit plures eorum.

Item dicunt quod Iohannes Iue inuenit quamdam damam mortuam de morina, et dixit Godwino filio Willelmi de Corby quod suspenderet eam sursum; et tunc idem G. escoriauit eandem damam et vendidit coreum cuidam homini de Gretton' pro vno denario. Et preceptum fuit quod capiatur; et statim venit et finem fecit cum iusticiario per dimidiam marcam ut sit sub pleuina usque aduentum iusticiariorum de foresta; et inuenit plegios [2] . . .

dimidia marca.

Item dicunt quod erbagium de parco de Brixstok' bene custoditur ad opus domini regis; set quod Iohannes Prentut cariare fecit duos carectatos feni ad domum Henrici prepositi de Brixtok' ad opus iusticiarii de foresta quando illic venisset et ad equm suum proprium de Acwellesik' ubi fenum creuit.

Item dicunt quod Iacobus de Thurleberg' tempore domini G. de

[1] See p. 36 above.

[2] Twelve names.

Elias of Stanion.
Ralph the painter of Islip.
William the son of Richard outside the town.
Henry Jocehom of the same town.
Lawrence Frankeleyn of Weldon.
William the son of Robert of the same town.
William of Twywell in Stanion.

Townships:—Geddington, Oakley, Brigstock, Corby and Stanion, which are sworn.

And they say upon their oath that they suspect that Henry Newborn of Islip during the past three years has gone with bows and arrows in the park of Brigstock and in the Farming wood.

And Solomon of Oakley was at the same time an evil doer in the same woods with bows and arrows; and he avows himself by Sir Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest. And they say that the same Solomon is privy to all the men who have gone into the forest with bows to do evil to the venison of the lord king; and he is associated to them.

Also they say that Simon the son of Roger of Geddington goes with bows and barbed arrows in the park of Brigstock. And he is not a sworn forester, wherefore they suspect that he is an evil doer to the venison of the lord king and privy to all evil doers in the same park; and he avows himself by John Spigurnel. And therefore he finds pledges of answering before the justices, to wit, Colin the son of William the son of Fulk of Geddington and Richard of Horton of the same town.

Be it remembered that the aforesaid Solomon met the men who robbed the cart at Lapworth cross in the forest of Geddington and he recognised several of them.

Also they say that John Ive found a certain doe which died of murrain; and he told Godwin the son of William of Corby to hang it up. And then the same Godwin flayed the same doe and sold the skin to a certain man of Gretton for a penny. And it was ordered that he be taken; and immediately he came and made fine with the justice by half a mark that he might be under pledge till the coming of the justices of the forest; and he found pledges. . . .

Also they say that the herbage of the park of Brigstock is well kept for the use of the lord king; but they say that John Prentut caused two cartloads of hay to be carried to the house of Henry the reeve of Brigstock, for the use of the justice of the forest, when he came there, and for his own horse, from Acwellsike, where the hay grew.

Also they say that James of Thurlbear, at the time when Sir

Langel', dum fuit iusticiarius de foresta, cucurrit cum mota sua et leporariis suis et berselettis et congregauit multociens cum arcubus et sagittis decem et octo homines et multam fecerunt destruccionem de venacione domini regis in omnibus balliuis foreste, ex quo foresta multum destructa erat per eundem Iacobum et socios suos.

Walterus Kakilberd, homo domini Hugonis de Goldingh', senescalli foreste, venit in foresta de Geytington' in Westle, et prostrauit duas quercus per terram in dominico bosco domini regis et terciam quercum in Themanneshedg' per terram in dominico bosco domini regis. Et cariate fuerunt dicte quercus ad Acle ad domum eiusdem Walteri cum carecta domini Hugonis predicti et equis et hominibus.

Willelmus Wic de Geytington' cepit vnum blettronem in Springeshedg' in dominico bosco domini regis; nesciunt quo waranto; et ideo inuenit plegios respondendi coram iusticiariis Radulfum ad Pontem et Robertum Pistorem de Geytington'.

Item dicunt quod predictus Salomon collexit vnam carectatam plenam de glande in foresta, et venit itinerando per Riston'; et ibidem eadem carecta athachiata erat; et nesciebant quomodo deliberata fuit.

[1] Ricardus Burel' de Bouton'	Walterus Freman de Geytingt'	iurati
Rogerus Franceys de Neuton'	Simon clericus de Grafton'	
Willelmus Freman de eadem	Petrus filius Willelmi de Bouton'	
Rogerus filius Alicie de Bouton'	Willelmus clericus de Wicle	
Radulfus Basset de Slipton'	Henricus clericus de Slipton'	
Robertus filius Iohannis de Twiwell'	Henricus ad crucem de eadem	
Ricardus de Cotes		

qui iurati dicunt quod viride et venacio bene custoditur.

Dicunt eciam quod omnes forestarii fideles sunt; et nichil aliud sciunt de illis.

Dicunt eciam quod Acwellesik' falcatur pro medietate per balliuos; et vna medietas adunatur et ponitur super quemdam tassum preter quamdam partem que ducitur ad Brixstok'.

Langel' falcatur pro medietate, et totum fenum est ibi integrum.

Dicunt eciam quod Salomon et Nopping' et Simon filius Rogeri de Geytington' non sunt forestarii iurati, et tamen eunt cum arcubus et sagittis barbatis.

[2] Item dicunt quod nullam suspeccionem habent uersus aliquem de

[1] The object of having a second jury sworn is not apparent. Perhaps the first one was concerned with malefactors in the forest, while the second gave answers to a list of general interrogatories.

[2] See pp. 35 and 106.

Geoffrey of Langley was justice of the forest, hunted with his pack, and his greyhounds and bercelets and frequently assembled eighteen men with bows and arrows. And they wrought much destruction to the venison of the lord king, in all the bailiwicks of the forest, whereby the forest was much impaired by the said James and his fellows.

Walter Kakilberd, the man of Sir Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, came into the forest of Geddington at Westleigh, and felled to the ground two oaks in the demesne wood of the lord king; and a third oak in Themanneshedge in the demesne wood of the lord king. And the said oaks were carried to Oakley, to the house of the same Walter, with the cart of Sir Hugh aforesaid and with his horses and men.

William Wick of Geddington took a sapling in Springshedge in the demesne wood of the lord king; by what warrant they know not; and therefore he finds pledges of making answer before the justices Ralph atte Bridge and Robert the baker of Geddington.

And they say that the aforesaid Solomon collected a full cartload of mast in the forest and went on his way through Rushton; and there the same cart was attached; and they knew not how it was delivered.

Richard Burel of Boughton
Roger Franceis of Newton
William Freman of the same town
Roger the son of Alice of Boughton
Ralph Basset of Slipton
Robert the son of John of Twywell
Richard of Cotes
Walter Freman of Geddington
Simon the clerk of Grafton
Peter the son of William of Boughton
William the clerk of Weekley
Henry the clerk of Slipton
Henry atte Cross of the same town

are sworn and say that the vert and the venison are well preserved.

They say also that the foresters are faithful; and that they know nothing else of them.

They say also that Acwellsike is mown as to one moiety by the bailiffs; and one moiety is stacked and put upon a certain straddle, except a certain part which is carried to Brigstock.

Langley is mown as to one moiety, and all the hay there kept together.

They say also that Solomon and Nopping and Simon the son of Roger of Geddington are not sworn foresters; and yet they go with bows and barbed arrows.

And they say that they suspect no one of the doe with which

dama cum qua Galfridus Catel captus fuit; nisi uersus eundem G., qui eandem damam stulte inuenit.

[1] Dicunt quod Walterus Kakilberd amputauit duas quercus in Westle et vnam in Themanneshedge; nesciunt quo waranto.

Dicunt quod erbagium bene custoditur et nullum sciunt inde malefactorem, nisi sit de escapiis, et ob hoc pontores [2] recipiunt denarios per talliam contra forestarios.

Forestarii de bosco de firma de Brixstok' dicunt quod Thomas filius Odeyn de Rokingh' et Robertus de Freney sunt malefactores foreste et depredatores.

Inquisicio facta apud Ayscros sub bosco de Deresburg' die [3] Lune in festo sancti Michaelis anno eodem coram H. de Goldingh', senescallo foreste, et Iohanne Luuet, viridario, de quadam fera . . . per Iohannem personam de Arnigworth', dicentem Iohanni Luuet, viridario, quod vidit duos homines fratris Roberti de Mauneby ferre vnam feram super vnum pelum . . . die [4] Martis proxima ante festum sancti Michaelis per quatuor villatas propinquiores, scilicet, Deresburg', Braybroc et Brampton', que plenarie venerunt, et dixerunt per sacramentum suum quod totum falsum fuit; quod bene sciunt, quia eodem die Martis viderunt homines dicti fratris Roberti ferre vnum leporem super vnum baculum in deductu suo uersus hospicium, quem ceperunt in bosco de Deresburg' cum canibus domini sui.

Thorp sub bosco summonita fuit et non venit.

Nicholaus [5] de Romes' cepit quatuor damas in parco de Brixstok' die [6] Iouis proxima ante festum sancti Thome apostoli anno tricesimo octauo cum canibus E. de Bosco,[7] iusticiarii foreste, ad opus eiusdem E.

Per breue. Frater Robertus de Mauneby cepit in foresta de Rokingh' die [8] Sabbati ante festum sancti Vincencii anno eodem tres damas; et die [9] Lune proxima sequenti tres damas de dono domini regis.

E. de Bosco, iusticiarius foreste, cepit vnam damam in landa de Banefeld' die [10] Mercurii proxima sequenti; et die Iouis proxima sequenti in Thornhawe vnam damam, et in parco duas damas.

[1] This was presented by the first jury also.

[2] The ordinary works of reference say nothing of this word.

[3] 29 September 1253.

[4] 23 September 1253.

[5] Nicholas of Romsey was a forest justice in eyre at Northampton in June 1255. See p. 27 above.

[6] 18 December 1253.

[7] See p. 15, note 3.

[8] 17 January $125\frac{3}{4}$.

[9] 19 January $125\frac{3}{4}$.

[10] 21 January $125\frac{3}{4}$.

Geoffrey Catel was taken, except the same Geoffrey, who found the same doe by chance.

They say also that Walter Kakilberd cut down two oaks in Westleigh and one in Themanneshedge; by what warrant they know not.

They say that the herbage is well kept, and they know no evil doer with respect to it except it be with respect to escapes, and for this the "pontores" receive pence by a tally against the foresters.

The foresters of the wood of Brigstock Farming say that Thomas the son of Odeyn of Rockingham and Robert de Freney are evil doers to the forest, and robbers.

An inquisition was made at Ayscros under Desborough wood on Monday[3] the feast of St. Michael in the same year, before Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, and John Lovet, the verderer, concerning a certain deer . . . by John the parson of Arthingworth, who told John Lovet, the verderer, that he saw two men of Brother Robert of Manby carrying a deer upon a stake . . . on the Tuesday[4] next before the feast of St. Michael by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Desborough, Braybrooke, and Brampton, who came fully and said upon their oath that it was all false; and this they well knew, because on the same Tuesday they saw the men of the said Brother Robert carrying upon a stick, as they went towards their lodging, a hare which they took in Desborough wood with the hounds of their lord.

Thorpe Underwood was summoned and did not come.

Nicholas of Romsey took four does in the park of Brigstock on the Thursday[6] next before the feast of St. Thomas the Apostle, in the thirty-eighth year, with the hounds of Arnold de Bois, the justice of the forest, for the use of the same Arnold.

By writ. Brother Robert of Manby took three does in the forest of Rockingham on the Saturday[8] next before the feast of St. Vincent in the same year; and three bucks on the Monday[9] next following, of the gift of the lord king.

Arnold de Bois, the justice of the forest, took a doe in Beanfield lawn on the Wednesday[10] next following; and a doe in Thornhawe, and two does in the park on the Thursday next following.

[1] Inquisicio facta apud Vndele coram E. de Bosco, iusticiario foreste, die [2] sanctorum Fabiani et Sebastiani anno eodem per forestarios et viridarios qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod Wido . . . die Martis proxima post festum sancti Thome Martiris . . . et iuit apud Lilleford ad prandium suum et sic iuit . . . brokettum dami trahentem vnum pelum vna corda attachiata ad pedes . . . fugit uersus boscum et in bosco athachiauit se inter duo ligna . . . captus erat. Et dictus Wido abiit ad prandium suum et fecit Rogerum de Pontefracto tunc garcionem suum, ibidem expectare ad insidiandum si quis voluit feram illam asportare. Et cito postea venerunt Nicholaus et Simon, filii [3] Swain de Lyueden', et Simon wodewardus domini Mauricii Daundely, et asportauerunt feram illam. Et dictus Rogerus peciit ab eisdem partem inde aliquem ; set nichil ei dederunt. Et venacio predicta asportata fuit ad domum Bate de Pilketon' et ibidem manducata est.

Item dicunt quod die [4] Lune in crastino sancti Andree apostoli anno predicto venit dominus H. de Goldingh', senescallus foreste, de uersus swanimottum de Clyue transieus per mediam forestam de Clyue in balliua de Morhey. Et tunc subito ex inprouiso insurrexerunt ei et hominibus suis cum arcubus et sagittis Hugo Monachus, persona de Thirningg', Philippus Scissor qui tunc fuit cum Berengero le Moyne, Galfridus de Wadynho, Willelmus filius persone de Thornhawe, Ricardus Scroty de Vpthorp, Iohannes Scroty, frater eius, quietus. Galfridus Duke de Vpthorp, Robertus Iouce de Lyueden', . . .[5] de Burgo et Bate de Lyueden' qui omnes sunt malefactores in foresta domini regis de venacione sua.

Dicunt eciam quod Henricus nepos decani de Vndel', Robertus persona de Polebroc, Willelmus de Burg', persona de Bernek', persona de Iakesl', Elias persona de Thornhawe sunt receptatores dictorum malefactorum.

[6] Item dicunt quod Radulfus Iuilhering de Lufwic et Walterus filius Roberti Percheuyd sunt malefactores de venacione domini regis in balliua de Rokingham et alibi cum arcubus et sagittis.

Plegii Simonis de Acle pro essarto :—[7]

Plegii eiusdem Simonis pro fossato de nouo facto :—[8]

[1] See p. 36 above.

[2] Tuesday, 20 January 125¾.

[3] In the eyre roll one son is called Walter and the other Nicholas.

[4] 1 December 1253.

[5] A word no longer legible has been cancelled here.

[6] See p. 36 above.

[7] Six or more names, some of them illegible.

[8] Six names.

An inquisition was made at Oundle before Arnold de Bois, the justice of the forest, on the day [2] of Saints Fabian and Sebastian in the same year by the foresters and verderers, who say upon their oath that Guy . . . on the Tuesday next after the feast of St. Thomas the Martyr . . . went to Lilford to his dinner, and as he went [he saw] a buck's broket dragging a stake, with a cord fastened to its feet. And it fled towards the wood and entangled itself between two trees and was taken. And the said Guy went away to his dinner, and caused Roger of Pontefract, who was then his page, to wait there watching secretly to see if anyone wished to carry away that deer. And immediately afterwards Nicholas and Simon, the sons of Sweyn of Lyveden, and Simon the woodward of Sir Maurice Daundelay came and carried away that deer. And the said Roger demanded some part thereof from them; but they gave nothing to him. And the venison aforesaid was carried to the house of Bate of Pilton and eaten there.

And they say that on Monday [4] the morrow of St. Andrew the Apostle Sir Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, came away from the swanimote of Cliffe, passing across the middle of the forest of Cliffe through the bailiwick of Morehay. And then suddenly and unexpectedly there arose before him and his men with bows and arrows Hugh le Moin, the parson of Thurning, Philip the tailor, who was with Berenger le Moin, Geoffrey of Wadenhoe, William the son of the parson of Thornhaugh, Richard Scroty of Upthorp, John Scroty, his brother, Geoffrey Duke of Upthorp, Robert Jouce of Lyveden . . . of Borough, and Bate of Lyveden, who are all evil doers in the forest of the lord king to his venison.

They say also that Henry the nephew of the dean of Oundle, Robert the parson of Polebrook, William of Burgh, the parson of Barnack, the parson of Yaxley, and Elias of Thornhaugh are harbourers of the said evil doers.

And they say that Ralph Iuelhering of Lowick and Walter the son of Robert Perchead are evil doers to the venison of the lord king in the bailiwick of Rockingham; and elsewhere with bows and arrows.

Pledges of Simon of Oakley for an assart :—

Pledges for the same Simon for a ditch recently made :—

Accidit die[1] Mercurii proxima post Ascensionem domini anno regni regis Henrici tricesimo nono quod Willelmus Champeneys, forestarius eques, et Robertus de Audewincl' et socius suus forestarii pedites venerunt in landa de Banefeld' ad horam nonam ita quod apud Abremannyslep' obuiauerunt vni leporario nigro coueire currenti ad vnam herdiam bestiarum et eum ceperunt. Postea venerunt duo homines equites quorum vnus vocatur Alanus de Sumeresha', seruiens domini Rogeri de Thurkeleby, et alius Vincencius filius Seluestri capellani de Rowell', sequentes leporarium. Et dictus Alanus dixit quod leporarius ille fuit leporarius domini sui et ab eo euasit, sicut transiuit per mediam landam; et ideo inuenit plegios respondendi inde coram iusticiariis Robertum filium Henrici de Iarewell' et Iohannem de Folkesworth'.

Plegii Vincencii respondendi inde coram iusticiariis[2] . . .

W. de Valenc' et Iohannes comes Warenn' venerunt apud Geytington' die[3] Iouis in crastino sancti Augustini anno eodem et ceperunt in parco de Brixstok' quinque damos et duas damas, et die Veneris in balliua de Rokingh' vnum ceruum septem damos et vnam damam; et die Sabbati in parco vnum damum, sex damas et in bosco de firma vnum ceruum duos damos et quinque damas.

Dominus rex et regina venerunt apud Geytington' die[4] Iouis in octabis sancti Iohannis Baptiste et perhendinauerunt per decem dies sequentes et ceperunt venacionem pro uoluntate sua.

[5]Accidit die[6] Sabbati proxima post Assumpcionem beate Marie anno tricesimo nono quod Stephanus le Graung', garcio Willelmi Chaumpeneys, uenit in Bassethawe, bosco domini Roberti Basset, post nonam ita quod inuenit in eodem bosco quatuor cordas extensas circa vnum plateum aque ad feras capiendas. Statim monstrauit hoc Roberto de Audewincle et Waltero de Rose, forestariis peditibus, qui tota nocte uigilauerunt ibi ad insidiandum si aliquis ueniret ad predicta ingenia, et nemo ibi uenit.

In crastino, uero, scilicet, die Dominica inquisicio inde facta fuit coram H. de Goldingham, senescallo foreste, et Willelmo de Camera de Weledune, viridario, per villatas subscriptas, scilicet, Riston, Deres-

[1] 12 May 1255.
[2] Six names.
[3] 27 May 1255.
[4] 1 July, 1255.
[5] The rest of the proceedings on this roll relate to matters which happened after the session in eyre at Northampton in the year 1255 had already begun. See p. 27, note 2 above.
[6] 21 August 1255.

It happened on the Wednesday [1] next after Ascension day in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of king Henry that William Champeneys, riding forester, and Robert of Aldwinkle and his fellow, walking foresters, came into the lawn of Beanfield at the ninth hour and so they met at Abremannyslep a black brindled greyhound, which was running after a herd of beasts, and they took it. Afterwards two men on horseback, of whom one was called Alan of Somersham, the servant of Sir Roger of Thirkleby, and the other Vincent the son of Silvester the chaplain of Rothwell, came following the greyhound. And the said Alan said that the greyhound belonged to his lord and escaped from him, as he passed across the middle of the lawn. And therefore he finds pledges of answering therefore before the justices, to wit, Robert the son of Henry of Yarwell and John of Folksworth.

The pledges of Vincent answering therefor before the justices were . . .

W. de Valence and John, earl de Warrenne, came to Geddington on Thursday [3] the morrow of St. Augustine in the same year and took five bucks and two does in the park of Brigstock; and on Friday in the bailiwick of Rockingham a hart, seven bucks and a doe; and on Saturday in the park one buck and six does; and in the Farming wood a hart, two bucks and five does.

The lord king and the queen came to Geddington on Thursday [4] the octave of St. John the Baptist, and tarried there during the eight following days; and they took venison at their pleasure.

It happened on the Saturday [6] next after the Assumption of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-ninth year, that Stephen le Graunger, the page of William Champeneys, came to Bassethawe, the wood of Sir Robert Basset, after noon, and so he found in the same wood four strings stretched around a dish of water for the purpose of taking beasts. Forthwith he showed this to Robert of Aldwinkle and Walter de Rose, the walking foresters, who watched all night there to see, in concealment, if anyone came to the aforesaid instruments, and no one came there.

And on the morrow, to wit Sunday, an inquisition thereof was made before Hugh of Goldingham, the steward of the forest, and William of the chamber of Weldon, the verderer, by the underwritten townships, to wit, Rushton, Desborough, Brampton and Stoke, who

burg', Braumpton' et Stok', que plenarie uenerunt et iurate dixerunt quod nichil inde sciuerunt.

Dominus Robertus Basset comparuit et inuenit duodecim plegios qui manuceperunt Petrum filium Marie de Riston' forestarium de bosco ubique eum producendi . . . .[1]

Corde predicte commisse fuerunt Willelmo de Camera, viridario, tenende coram iusticiariis.

Boscus captus fuit in manu domini regis.

Accidit die[2] Sabbati proxima ante festum sancti Mathei apostoli anno regni regis tricesimo nono in uia regia de Wininge circa mediam noctem quod Willelmus Weutrer et Elias de Stretford', forestarii pedites, uigilantes in balliua obuiauerunt tribus hominibus, quorum vnus equitabat vnum equm; et percipiens ille equitans dictos forestarios effugit; et dictus Willelmus traxit ad eum vnam sagittam, vnde vnus saccus sanguinolentus et pilosus cecidit ab illo fugiente; quem saccum dicti forestarii inuenerunt. Postea dicti forestarii obuiauerunt Thome filio Alexandri et Waltero filio Fythyhun de Liuedene et ipsos arestari fecerunt; vnde inquisicio super hoc facta fuit per viridarios et forestarios et per quatuor villatas propinquiores scilicet, Wadeho, Pilketon', Liueden', Stok'.

Liueden', iurata, dicit quod predicti Thomas et Walterus non fuerunt in societate illius fugientis nec culpabiles alicuius venacionis domini regis nec de sacco inuento per predictos forestarios.

Pilketon', Wadeho, Stok', iurate, concordant in omnibus cum Liueden', primo iurata.

Saccus liberatus fuit tribus hominibus de Liueden', scilicet, Bernardo, Ade filio Aldich, Henrico filio Allewyne ad proximum swanimotum, et ad proximum swanimotum commissus fuit Ricardo de Audewincle, viridario, ad tenendum coram iusticiariis foreste.

Willelmus Clifard' de Liueden, Adam filius Aldich de eadem et Willelmus Cidera' de eadem manuceperunt predictos Thomam filium Alexandri et Walterum filium Fythiun respondendi coram iusticiariis foreste.

[3]Accidit die[4] Lune proxima ante Natiuitatem beate Marie anno tricesimo nono quod Thomas filius Rogeri filii Fulconis de Geytington'

[1] Twelve names. [2] 18 September 1255.
[3] See p. 37 above. The account of the trespass differs materially from that recorded on the eyre roll. Even the names of the persons implicated do not correspond.
[4] 6 September 1255.

came fully. They were sworn, and said that they knew nothing thereof.

Sir Robert Basset appeared and found twelve pledges as mainperners of Peter the son of Mary of Rushton, the forester of the wood, to produce him wheresoever required.

The strings aforesaid were given to William of the chamber, the verderer, to produce before the justices.

The wood was taken into the hands of the lord king.

It happened on the Saturday[3] next before the feast of St. Matthew the Apostle in the thirty-ninth year of the reign of the king that William Weutrer and Elias of Stretford, the walking foresters, as they watched in their bailiwick, met in the king's highway from Wininge about the middle of the night three men, one of whom rode upon a horse. And the man on horseback, when he saw the said foresters, fled. And the said William shot an arrow at him, whereupon a sack, bloody and covered with hair, fell from him. And the said foresters found the sack. Afterwards the said foresters met Thomas the son of Alexander and Walter the son of Fythiun of Lyveden, and caused them to be arrested; wherefore an inquisition was made thereupon by the foresters and verderers and by four neighbouring townships, to wit, Wadenhoe, Pilton, Lyveden and Stoke.

Lyveden is sworn, and says that the aforesaid Thomas and Walter were not in the company of the man who fled, nor were they guilty of any offence against the venison of the lord king nor concerning the sack found by the aforesaid foresters.

Pilton, Wadenhoe and Stoke are sworn, and agree in all respects with Lyveden, which was first sworn.

The sack was delivered to three men of Lyveden, to wit, Bernard, Adam the son of Aldich and Henry the son of Ailwin till the next swanimote; and at the next swanimote it was given to Richard Aldwinkle, the verderer, to produce before the justices of the forest.

William Clifard of Lyveden, Adam the son of Aldich of the same town and Willam Cideran of the same town were mainperners for the aforesaid Thomas the son of Alexander and Walter the son of Fythiun answering before the justices of the forest.

It happened on Monday[4] next before the Nativity of the Blessed Mary in the thirty-ninth year that Thomas the son of Roger the son of

venit in parco de Brixstok' super Stocfoldehil supra Osbern Ridyng' circa horam terciam ita quod percepit vnum architenentem cum arcu et sagittis et vnum garcionem cum eo qui ceperant vnam feram que iacuit coram eis. Et ipsi voluerunt tractare ad dictum Thomam, et ipse fugit set nesquit qui ipsi fuerunt. Postea idem Thomas eodem die ad noctem venit ad Ricardum de Horton' et Robertum filium Roberti de Geytington', et monstrauit eis hoc factum ita quod ipsi tres vigilauerunt extra villam de Geytington' ad insidiandum si aliquis duceret carnem uersus uillam de Geytington. Et tunc supervenit Rogerus clericus de eadem ita quod extra uillam inuenerunt Hugonem Kydelomb de Geytington' cum quatuor spaulis venacionis retentis, et vnum capud dami cum toto collo, et aliud capud dame cum toto collo. Et interogauerunt dictum garcionem ubi habuit dictam venacionem, et ipse dixit quod architenentes illam ei dederunt in bosco eodem die; set qui illi architenentes fuerunt nesquit.

Postea intrauerunt uillam et Ricardus de Horton' stetit ad hostium suum ita quod vidit Willelmum de Wermigton', fratrem Willelmi de Wermigton', intrantem uillam cum arcu et sagittis, et cum eo vnum garcionem equitantem vnum equm sorbauzwan ducentem venacionem. Predictus garcio equitans percipiens predictum Ricardum reliquid equm et fugit. Et predictus Willelmus ascendit equum et transiuit pontem de Geytington' cum venacione et intrauit venellam uersus domum Willelmi de Wermigton', fratris sui.

Postea inquisicio facta fuit apud Geytingt' die[1] Dominica proxima post festum sancti Mathei apostoli coram domino G. de Leukenor', H. de Goldingh' Ricardo de Audewincle, Willelmo de Camera viridariis per quatuor villatas Geytington', Button', Wicle et Parua Neuton', que venerunt et, iurate, dixerunt per sacramentum suum quod nichil inde sciuerunt; set melius intelligunt quod falsum sit quam verum.

Ricardus de Horton' cognouit quod predictus Thomas habuit vnam spauliam de dono predicti Hugonis Kydelomb et quod dictus Thomas eidem Ricardo dedit inde ad manducandum.

Rogerus clericus inuenit plegios veniendi coram iusticiariis. . . .[2]

Thomas filius Rogeri inuenit plegios veniendi etc . . . .[2]

Ricardus de Horton' inuenit plegios veniendi coram iusticiariis . . . .[2]

Willelmus de Wermigton' inuenit plegios de veniendo coram iusticiariis . . . .[2]

[1] 26 September 1255. [2] Four names.

Fulk of Geddington came about the third hour into the park of Brigstock at Stockfoldhill above Osbern Riding. And so he perceived a bowman with a bow and arrows, and a page with him, who had taken a deer which lay in front of them. And they wished to shoot at the said Thomas, and he fled, but he does not know who the men were. Afterwards the same Thomas on the same day towards night came to Richard of Horton and Robert the son of Robert of Geddington and showed them what had happened, so that the three watched outside the town of Geddington, to see in concealment if anyone brought the flesh towards the town of Geddington. And then Roger the clerk, of the same town, came; and so outside the town they found Hugh Kydelomb of Geddington with four shoulders of venison, which he had retained, and one head of a buck with the whole neck, and one head of a doe with the whole neck. And they demanded of the same page whence he had the said venison; and he said that some men with bows gave it to him in the wood on the same day, but who the men with bows were he knew not.

Afterwards they entered the town and Richard of Horton stood at his door, so that he saw William of Warmington, the brother of William of Warmington, entering the town with a bow and arrows together with a page who rode upon a sorrel horse with white feet and carried venison. The aforesaid boy on horseback, when he perceived the aforesaid Richard, left his horse and fled. And the aforesaid William mounted his horse and crossed Geddington bridge with the venison, and entered the lane towards the house of William of Warmington, his brother.

Afterwards an inquisition was made at Geddington on the Sunday [1] next after the feast of St. Mathew the Apostle before Sir Geoffrey of Lewknor, Hugh of Goldingham, and Richard of Aldwinkle and William of the chamber, the verderers, by four townships, Geddington, Boughton, Weekley, and Little Newton, who came and, being sworn, said upon their oath that they knew nothing thereof; but they rather thought that it was false than true.

Richard of Horton acknowledged that the aforesaid Thomas had a shoulder of the aforesaid Hugh Kydelomb; and that the said Thomas gave part thereof to the same Richard to eat.

Roger the clerk finds pledges of coming before the justices. . . .[2]

Thomas the son of Roger finds pledges of coming etc. . . .[2]

Richard of Horton finds pledges of coming before the justices. . . .[2]

William of Warmington finds pledges of coming before the justices. . . .[2]

Predictus Hugo Kydelomb committitur toti villate de Geytington' in ballium que eum manucepit producendi coram iusticiariis apud Norhamt' in crastino sancti Michaelis.

Forestarii domini regis de parco de Brixstok' dicunt per sacramentum suum quod Hugo filius persone de Grafton' est malefactor in foresta de venacione domini regis et visus fuit in parco Brixstok' die [1] Natiuitatis beate Marie circa horam nonam cum arcu et sagittis; et quidam alius cum eo cum arcu et sagittis; et duxit vnum canem ruffum coueyre . . . set nullum recettum habent in patria quod scire possunt.

Ricardus de Horton' dicit quod Robertus de la Langel' venit de bosco cum Hugone [Kydelomb et] fuit socius ad venacionem ferendam.

Dicit eciam quod Willelmus de Wermigton' et Colinus de Geytington' sunt malefactores de venacione et consueuerunt malefacere in hoc Augusto qualibet septimana et quod Willelmus Bolle forestarius fuit consenciens eis, et bene sciuit de illo malefacto; et dicit eciam quod Rogerus Caperun bene sciuit de illa venacione eadem nocte.

Dicit eciam quod Willelmus de Wermigton receptauit Willelmum fratrem suum cum malefacto suo. Et Willelmus filius Fulconis receptauit Colinum filium suum cum malefacto suo.

Liberata fuerunt Radulfo vicario de Geytington' dua robora in foresta de Geytington' de dono domini regis.

XIII.[2]

PERAMBULACIONES FORESTARUM FACTE IN DIUERSIS COMITATIBUS ANNO REGNI REGIS EDWARDI FILII REGIS HENRICI VICECIMO OCTAUO.

[3] Rotel'.[4]—Perambulacio facta in comitatu Roteland' coram Rogero le Brabanzun et sociis suis die [5] Lune in crastino sancti Nicholai

[1] Wednesday, 8 September 1255.

[2] The letters patent and writs directing the perambulations of Rutland and Surrey to be made are dated 27 September 1299 and are recorded on Patent Roll 118, m. 9; those directing the perambulations of Nottingham and Warwick are dated 1 April 1300 and are recorded on Patent Roll 119, m. 19. The perambulations of Rutland, Nottingham and Warwick are recorded on the Great Roll of Perambulations to which the reference is *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 102, but the forest of Windsor or Surrey, of which no part was disafforested in consequence of the perambulations, is not recorded on this roll.

[3] *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 102, m. 15.

[4] The boundaries of the forest of Rutland as they were in the reign of Henry iii. are printed on p. 53, above.

[5] 7 December 1299.

The aforesaid Hugh Kydelomb is committed on bail to the whole township of Geddington, who are mainperners to produce him before the justices at Northampton on the morrow of St. Michael.

The foresters of the lord king of the park of Brigstock say upon their oaths that Hugh the son of the parson of Grafton is an evil doer in the forest to the venison of the lord king, and was seen in the park of Brigstock with a bow and arrows on the day [1] of the Nativity of the Blessed Mary about the ninth hour. And a certain other person was with him with a bow and arrows; and he led a red brindled dog; . . . . but they have no abode in the country of which they know.

Richard of Horton says that Robert of Langley came from the wood with Hugh Kydelomb and helped him to carry the venison.

He says also that William of Warmington and Colin of Geddington are evil doers to the venison and were in the habit of doing evil every week in this August; and that William Bolle, the forester, was privy to them, and well knew of that evil doing; and he says also that Roger Caperun well knew of that venison on the same night.

He says also that William of Warmington harboured William, his brother, with the fruit of his evil doing. And William the son of Fulk haboured Colin his son with the fruit of his evil doing.

Two trees for fuel were delivered to Ralph the vicar of Geddington in the forest of Geddington, of the gift of the lord king.

XIII.

PERAMBULATIONS OF THE FORESTS MADE IN DIVERS COUNTIES IN THE TWENTY-EIGHTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD THE SON OF KING HENRY.

Rutland.—Perambulation made in the county of Rutland before Roger le Brabancon and his fellows on Monday [5] the morrow of St.

anno regni regis Edwardi vicesimo octauo per sacramentum Iohannis de Hotot, Roberti ad Aulam, Willelmi de Tolthorp, Ricardi Tayllard, Radulfi de Bella fago, Willelmo de sancto Licio, Ricardi de Middelton', Roberti de Bella fago, Walteri de Scultborp', Radulfi de Empingham, Reginaldi de Seyton', Roberti de Casterton', Henrici le Tannur de Okham, Iohannis Basset, Roberti de Castre, Ricardi ad Aulam, Iohannis de Braunston' et Roberti de Sculthorp', qui dicunt super sacramentum suum de cooperto foreste quod tamdiu exstitit in foresta quod nesciunt a quo tempore. Et dicunt quod omnes ville et terre extra metas et bundas subscriptas versus le Stubbedeston' et versus Staunford' preter quandam placeam, que vocatur Whicchele, videlicet, de Braunteston' vsque Brok' et de Brok' vsque Ridelington' et deinde vsque Asteneston' et deinde vsque Uppingha' includendo predictas villas de Braunteston' et alias versus forestam; et de Uppingham vsque in le Redegate, et sic sequendo le Redegate vsque in le Brodegate; et sic vsque ad Lidenton', et per medium Lidenton'; et deinde vsque Caldecote; et deinde vsque in aquam de Litele afforestati fuerunt tempore regis Iohannis.

In cuius rei testimonium huic scripto sigilla nostra apposuimus. Data apud Okham die et anno supradictis.

[1] WYNDESOR'.—Perambulacio facta de foresta de Wyndesor' in comitatu Surr' die [2] Sabbati proxima ante festum sancti Gregorii pape anno regni regis Edwardi vicesimo octauo apud Lambeheeth' coram Rogero Brabazon', Iohanne de Berewyk', Radulpho de Hengham, Willelmo Inge et Iohanne de Crokesle in presencia Philippi de Sai, clerici iusticiarii foreste, forestariorum, viridariorum foreste predicte per sacramentum Willelmi Aumbesas, Iohannis de Burstowe, Roberti de Bekwell', militum, Roberti le Dol, Roberti de Waletone, Willelmi de Northwode, Iohannis Prodhomme, Roberti atte Sonde, Nicholai de Westone, Ricardi de Horton', Edmundi de Otteworth' et Iohannis de Farnham; qui dicunt super sacramento suo quod totus comitatus de Surr' fuit foresta tempore Henrici regis proaui regis nunc, unde idem Henricus rex obiit seisitus; et ita remansit foresta vsque ad quartum diem Decembris anno regni regis Ricardi primo, qui tunc

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 106. The Great Roll of Perambulations mentioned in Note 2, p. 116 above contains letters patent with recitals of the perambulations then recently made, which disafforested the districts lying outside the boundaries so ascertained. As the boundaries of the forest of Surrey were found to be the same as they had hitherto been considered to be, there was no district to be disafforested, and there were therefore no letters patent to be enrolled on the Great Roll. The boundaries of the forest of Surrey, as they were in the latter part of the reign of Henry iii., are printed on p. 61 above.

[2] Saturday, 5 March 1299–1300.

Nicholas in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of king Edward by the oath of John of Huttoft, Robert atte Hall, William of Tolthorp, Richard Tayllard, Ralph de Beaufay, William de Senlis, Richard of Middleton, Robert de Beaufay, Walter of Sculthorpe, Ralph of Empingham, Reynold of Seaton, Robert of Casterton, Henry the tanner of Oakham, John Basset, Robert of Castor, Richard atte Hall, John of Braunston, and Robert of Sculthorpe; who say upon their oath as to the covert of the forest, that it has been so long in the forest that they know not from what time. And they say that all the towns and lands outside the underwritten metes and bounds towards Stumpsden and towards Stamford, except a certain place which is called Whitchley, to wit from Braunston to Brooke and from Brooke to Ridlington, and from there to Ayston, and from there to Uppingham, including the aforesaid towns of Braunston and others towards the forest, and from Uppingham to the Redgate and so following the Redgate as far as the Broadgate, and so as far as Liddington and through Liddington, and so as far as Caldecott; and so into the water of the Little Eye, were afforested in the time of king John.

In witness whereof we have put our seals to this writing.

Given at Oakham on the day and year above written.

Windsor.—The perambulation of the forest of Windsor in the county of Surrey made on the Saturday [2] next before the feast of St. Gregory the pope in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of king Edward at Lambeth before Roger Brabancon, John of Berwick, Ralph of Hingham, William Inge, and John of Croxley in the presence of Philip de Sai, clerk of the justice of the forest, the foresters and verderers of the forest aforesaid by the oath of William Aumbesas, John of Burstow, Robert of Bekwell, knights, Robert le Dol, Robert of Walton, William of Northwood, John Prodhomme, Robert atte Send, Nicholas of Weston, Richard of Horton, Edmund of Utworth and John of Farnham, who say upon their oath that the whole county of Surrey was forest in the time of king Henry the great-grandfather of the king who now is, and the same king Henry died seised of it; and so it remained forest until the fourth day of December in the first year of the reign

deafforestauit quandam partem ipsius comitatus per certas metas que continentur in carta ipsius regis Ricardi inde facta, videlicet inter Canciam et aquam, que dicitur Waye, et de monte[1] de Guldedone quantum comitatus Surr' durat versus meridiem; et residuum comitatus predicti, scilicet, incipiendo ad aquam de Waye per montem de Guldedoune, quantum comitatus Surr' durat versus aquilonem, remansit et est foresta. Et post illius carte confeccionem nichil afforestatum vel occupatum fuit per ipsum regem Ricardum nec per regem Iohannem nec per aliquem alium.

Dicunt eciam quod non sciunt quod aliquid de comitatu predicto afforestatum fuit per predictum Henricum proauum regis nunc.

In cuius rei testimonium iurati predicti sigilla sua apposuerunt.[2]

[3] NOTINGH'.—Perambulacio facta in comitatu Notingh' die [4] Veneris proxima post festum sancti Barnabe apostoli anno regni domini regis Edwardi filii domini regis Henrici vicesimo octauo coram Iohanne de Lythegreyns, Iohanne Byrun, Michaele de Hartecla, Harsculpho de Cleseby, Adam de Crokedayk' et Ricardo Oysel ad illam per breue domini regis faciendam assignatis in presencia Hugonis de Louther, attornati domini Roberti de Clifford' tunc iusticiarii forestarum domini regis vltra Trentam per litteras ipsius Roberti patentes, et in presencia forestariorum et viridariorum foreste de Schirewode per sacramentum Geruasii de Clifton', Iohannis Burdon', Iohannis de Leek', Rogero de sancto Andrea, Ranulphi de Wandeslay, Thome Malet, Ricardi Pauely, Willelmi de Colewyk', militum, Roberti de Kynmerley, Fulconis de Houetoft, Petri de Ludeham et Nicholai de Insula, seruientum[5]; qui dicunt super sacramentum suum, quod perambulacio[6] foreste domini regis de Schirewode incipit ad vadum de Conyngeswath' per chiminum quod se extendit vsque ad villam de

[1] Now known as the Hog's Back.

The following entry is enrolled upon the Great Roll of the Pipe of 2 Ric. i.: 'Milites de Surreia reddunt compotum de cc marcis ut sint amodo quieti de omnibus que pertinent ad forestam ab aqua Waie usque Cantiam et a strata de Geldedon uersus meridiem quantum Surreia extendit.'

[2] The whole of the forest of Surrey was disafforested by letters patent dated 26 December 1327 (see Patent Roll 168, m. 3), but it was again afforested according to the above boundaries by letters close dated 4 August 1333. See Close Roll 160, m. 3.

[3] *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 102, m. 10. There is another MS. of this perambulation in the Record Office, to which the reference is *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 44.

[4] 17 June 1300.

[5] The use of this word is remarkable. The four persons it describes were not forest officers but landowners who were not knights. 'Libere tenentes' would be the words ordinarily used to describe them.

[6] The boundaries are traced from a point in the north of the forest through its eastern extremity as far as Nottingham in the south. It is then traced from the same point in the north through its western extremity as far as Nottingham. Many of the places mentioned in the perambulation are no longer marked in the maps.

of king Richard, who then disafforested a certain part of the same county by certain metes, which are contained in the charter of the same king Richard made concerning them, to wit, between Kent and the water which is called the Wey, and from the hill of Guild Down, as far as the county of Surrey extends towards the south; and the rest of the county aforesaid, to wit, beginning at the water of the Wey, as far as the county of Surrey extends, to the north of the hill of Guild Down, remained and is forest. And after that charter was made nothing was afforested or occupied by king Richard or by king John or by anybody else.

They say also that they do not know that any part of the county aforesaid was afforested by the aforesaid Henry the great-grandfather of the king who now is.

In witness whereof the aforesaid jurors have put their seals.

NOTTINGHAM.—The perambulation made in the county of Nottingham on the Friday [4] next after the feast of St. Barnabas the apostle in the twenty-eighth year of the reign of the lord king Edward the son of the lord king Henry before John of Lythegreyns, John Byron, Michael of Hartley, Hasculph of Cleasby, Adam of Crookdake and Richard Oysel assigned to make that perambulation by the writ of the lord king, in the presence of Hugh of Lowther, the attorney of Sir Robert of Clifford, then justice of the forests of the lord king beyond Trent, by the letters patent of the same Robert, and in the presence of the foresters and verderers of the forest of Sherwood by the oath of Gervais of Clifton, John Burdon, John of Leake, Roger of St. Andrews, Ranulph of Wansley, Thomas Malet, Richard Pavely, William of Colwick, knights, Robert of Kimberley, Fulk of Huttoft, Peter of Ludham and Nicholas de l'Isle, serjeants; who say upon their oath, that the perambulation of the lord king's forest of Sherwood begins at the ford of Conyngeswater, along the road

Wellehawe versus Notingh', ita quod clausum ville de Wellehawe est extra forestam, et sic deinde per idem chiminum quod se extendit inter Wellehawe et Notingh' vsque ad quandam particulam bosci, qui vocatur Littelhawe, et sic ascendendo per quandam viam versus occidentem inter dictum boscum et boscum abbatis de Rufford', qui vocatur Brunne et extendit se vsque Reynewathford', et deinde diuertendo per quandam viam versus orientem inter predictum boscum de Littelhawe et boscum de Blitheworth' vsque ad predictum magnum chiminum quod se extendit de Wellehawe versus Notingh' vsque Bakestanhowe super illud idem magnum chiminum, et sic deinde per idem chiminum vsque ad locum illum vbi riuulus de Douerbek' pertransit predictum chiminum, et deinde sicut riuulus predictus de Douerbek' descendit in aquam que vocatur Trente et sic in longo per eandem aquam de Trente ascendendo vsque ad pontem Notingh'.

Incipit eciam perambulacio predicta in eodem comitatu Notingh' ad predictum vadum de Conyngeswath' ascendendo versus occidentem per aquam que vocatur Medine vsque ad villam que vocatur Warsop', et ab eadem villa ascendendo per eandem aquam vsque ad parcum de Pleseley, et deinde ascendendo per ipsam aquam vsque ad Haytrebrigge, et deinde diuertendo per magnum chiminum de Notingh' vsque ad pontem de Mulneford', et deinde ascendendo vsque Mamesheued, et deinde inter campos de Herdewyk' et de Kyrkeby et moram de Kyrkeby usque ad angulum, qui vocatur Nonneker, et deinde per assartum Ywayn Breton' vsque ad Tarlesty, et deinde vsque ad Stolegate, et deinde per magnum chiminum vsque subtus vetus castellarium de Anneslay, et ab ipso castellario per magnum chiminum vsque ad villam de Lyndeby, et deinde per mediam villam de Lyndeby vsque ad molendinum eiusdem ville super aquam de Lene, et deinde descendendo per ipsam aquam vsque ad villam de Lenton', et deinde sicut ipsa aqua antiquitus currere solebat vsque in aquam que dicitur Trente, et sic descendendo [1] per ipsam aquam de Trente vsque ad pontem Notingh' predictum.

[2] WARR'.—Perambulacio illius partis foreste de Fecham que est in comitatu Warr' facta die [3] Mercurii in festo apostolorum Petri et Pauli

[1] The reading of the principal manuscript (No. 102) is 'ascendendo;' but in the other (No. 44) it is 'descendendo,' which is correct.

[2] Memb. 15. There is another copy of this perambulation at the Record Office, the reference to it being *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 34, but very little of it is now legible.

[3] 29 June 1300.

which leads as far as the town of Wellow towards Nottingham, so that the close of the town of Wellow is outside the forest, and so by the road which goes between Wellow and Nottingham to a certain parcel of wood which is called Littelhawe; and so ascending by a certain way towards the west between the said wood and the wood of the abbot of Rufford, which is called Brown, and extends as far as Rainworthford; and thence turning aside by a certain road towards the east between the aforesaid wood of Littelhawe and the wood of Blidworth as far as the aforesaid great road, which leads from Wellow towards Nottingham as far as Bakestanehowe on that same great road; and so by the same road as far as the place where the rivulet of Dover Beck crosses the aforesaid road; and thence as the aforesaid rivulet of Dover Beck descends into the water which is called the Trent; and so along the same water of the Trent upwards to Nottingham bridge.

The aforesaid perambulation also begins in the same county of Nottingham at the aforesaid ford of Conyngeswater, ascending towards the west by the water which is called Meden as far as the town which is called Warsop, and from that town ascending by the same water as far as Pleasley park; and thence ascending by the same water as far as Haytrebridge; and thence turning aside along the high road of Nottingham as far as the bridge of Milneford; and thence ascending as far as Mameshead; and thence between the fields of Hardwick and of Kirkby and the moor of Kirkby as far as the corner which is called Nonneker; and thence through the assart of Ywayn le Breton as far as Tarlesty; and thence as far as Stolegate; and thence along the high road as far as beneath the old castle of Annesley; and from the same castle along the high road as far as the town of Linby; and thence through the middle of the town of Linby as far as the mill of the same town on the water of the Leen; and from thence descending by the same water as far as the town of Lenton, and thence as that water was anciently wont to run as far as the water which is called the Trent, and so descending by the same water of the Trent as far as Nottingham bridge aforesaid.

Warwick.—The perambulation of that part of the forest of Feckenham which is in the county of Warwick, made on Wednesday[3] the feast of the apostles Peter and Paul, in the twenty-eighth year of

anno regni regis Edwardi vicesimo octauo in presencia Willelmi Ingge, Henrici de Cobeham, Willelmi de Mortuo Mari et Nicholai Fermbaud, iusticiariorum domini regis ad perambulacionem in comitatu predicto faciendam assignatorum, et per visum Iohannis de Boylonde positi loco Hugonis le Despens' iusticiarii foreste domini regis citra Trentam et in presencia Iohannis de Scheluestrode custodis foreste predicte. Et quia nullus forestarius de feodo nec viridarius est in comitatu isto perambulacio facta est per sacramentum Iohannis de Somery, Ricardi Turreuille, Petri de Wolwardinton' militum, Galfridi de Hamburi, Willelmi de Leye, Alexandri de Orenlefeld', Iohannis de Wilmecote, Roberti Lyuet, Willelmi de Whitinton', Rogeri de Holte, Henrici de Cliue, Willelmi de Hippewelle, Roberti de Val, Iohannis Passelewe, Roberti Baldewyne, Roberti de Wytheleye, Nicholai de Kyngleye, Iordani de la Wodegate, Ricardi de Gretenock' et Willelmi Wyberd de Schraueleye iuratorum; qui, visa parte illius foreste predicta existente in comitatu Warr', dicunt quod mete et bunde eiusdem foreste,[1] que nunc sunt in eodem comitatu, incipiunt apud la Rededich in villa de Hippesleye et sic descendendo per altam viam vsque ad riueram de Arewe; et deinde descendendo per eandem riueram vsque in ripariam de Auene et sic descendendo per eandem ripariam de Auene vsque ad locum qui vocatur Honyhamsterte; et ab illo loco vsque ad quercum que vocatur Tokenock' secundum quod mete et diuise se habent inter comitatum Wygorn' et comitatum Warr'; et del Tokenock' vsque ad locum qui vocatur Smethehedleye per easdem divisas; et de Smethehedleye vsque le Rededich' in Hippesleye vbi mete et bunde predicte prius inceperunt.

Et dicunt quod infra predictas bundas dominus Iohannes rex auus domini regis nunc afforestauit omnes villas et hameletta subscripta cum boscis vastis et planis earumdem villarum et hamelettorum ad dampnum dominorum subscriptorum tenencium villas et hameletta predicta, scilicet, quandam partem de Hippesleye versus occidentem cum bosco quam Iohannes Hubaud tenet, villam de Stodleye cum bosco citra riueram de Arewe, quam prior de Stodleye et magister milicie Templi in Anglia tenent, villam de Somburne cum membris bosco et plano, quam abbas de Euesham tenet, illam partem ville de Cocton' cum bosco et plano, que est citra riueram de Arewe versus occidentem, quam Willelmus de Spineto tenet, villam de Alicestr' cum bosco et plano, quam Walterus de Bello Campo et Willelmus de Botereaus tenent, situm grangie de Caldewelle, quem abbas de Alicestr'

[1] Apparently the forest extended over that part of the county which lay between the river Arrow and the boundary between Warwick and Worcester.

the reign of king Edward in the presence of William Inge, Henry of Cobham, William de Mortemer and Nicholas Fermbaud, justices of the lord king assigned for making the perambulation in the county aforesaid, and by the view of John of Boyland, put in the place of Hugh le Despencer, the justice of the forest of the lord king on this side Trent, and in the presence of John of Scheluestrode, the warden of the forest aforesaid. And because there is no forester in fee and no verderer in this county, the perambulation is made by the oath of John de Sommery, Richard Turville, Peter of Wolverton, knights, Geoffrey of Hanbury, William of Leigh, Alexander of Orenlefeld, John of Wilmcote, Robert Lyvet, William of Whittington, Roger of Holt, Henry of Cleeve, William of Hippewelle, Robert de Val, John Passelewe, Robert Baldwin, Robert of Weethley, Nicholas of Kingsley, Jordan de la Wodegate, Richard of Gretenock and William Wyberd of Shrawley, jurors; who, after a view of that part of the forest aforesaid which is in the county of Warwick, say that the metes and bounds of the same forest which now are in the same county begin at Redditch in the town of Ipsley, and so descending by the high road to the river Arrow; and from there descending by the same river as far as the river Avon as far as the place which is called Honyhamsterte; and from that place as far as the oak, which is called Tokenoak, according as the metes and bounds lie between the county of Worcester and the county of Warwick; and from the Tokenoak as far as the place which is called Smethehedleye and from Smethehedleye as far as the Redditch in Ipsley, where the metes and bounds aforesaid first began.

And they say that within the aforesaid bounds the lord king John the grandfather of the lord king who now is afforested all the underwritten towns and hamlets together with the woods, wastes and plains of the same towns and hamlets to the damage of the underwritten lords who hold the towns and hamlets aforesaid, to wit, a certain part of Ipsley towards the west together with the wood which John Hubaud holds, the town of Studley with the wood on this side of the river Arrow, which the prior of Studley and the master of the Knights Templars in England hold, the town of Sambourn with its members, and its wood and plain, which the abbot of Evesham holds, that part of the town of Coughton with its wood and plain, which is on the side of the river Arrow towards the west, which William of Spinney holds, the town of Alcester with its wood and plain which Walter de Beauchamp and William de Bottereaux hold, the site of the grange of Caldwell, which the abbot of Alcester holds, the town of

tenet, villam de Arewe cum membris et bosco quam Gerardus de Camuille tenet, villam Maioris Saltford' cum membris et bosco quam prior de Kenyleworthe tenet, villam de Salteforde Abbatis cum bosco quam abbas de Euesham tenet, villam de Wytheleye cum bosco quam Alexander de Abetot tenet.

Et omnes ville predicte et hameletta cum boscis vastis et planis fuerunt afforestati[1] per predictum Iohannem regem ad dampnum omnium tenencium supradictorum vnde dicunt quod primo anno coronacionis domini Henrici regis proaui domini regis nunc nulla fuit foresta in comitatu Warr' nec aliqua pars foreste de Fecham fuit in comitatu isto. Set dicunt quod quedam pars ville de Tardebigge quam abbas de Bordesleye tenet et que tempore coronacionis predicti domini regis proaui domini regis nunc fuit in comitatu Staff' modo est in comitatu isto; que quidem pars se extendit per regalem viam que ducit de villa de Bremesgraue versus villam de Alcestr' a sichetto qui vocatur Wychibrock' vsque ad Foxhuntelidgate ex parte occidentali eiusdem vie; set quis eam afforestauit seu cuius regis tempore illa pars fuit afforestata ignorant. Et iurati quesiti qualiter constat eis quod predictus dominus Iohannes rex afforestauit omnia maneria villas et hameletta predicta dicunt quod ex relatu antecessorum suorum et per commune dictum patrie.

In cuius rei testimonium predicti iuratores huic perambulacioni sigilla sua apposuerunt.

XIV. (*a*).[2]

INQUISICIO DE BALLIUA IOHANNIS FILII NIGELLI IN FORESTA DE BERNWODE.

Inquisicio facta per preceptum domini regis apud Herteleye in foresta de Bernwode die[3] Sabati proxima aute festum sancti Laurencii anno regni regis Henrici filii regis Iohannis quinquagesimo de hoc quod cum Iohannes filius Nigelli teneat balliuam foreste domini regis de Bernwode iure hereditario et dominus rex super hiis que ad ipsum Iohannem pertineant racione balliue predicte voluerit cerciorari et cuiusmodi iura et consuetudines occasione predicte balliue habere

[1] MS. 'afforeste.' [2] *Inquisit. post mort.* 50 Hen. iii. No. 25. [3] 7 August 1266.

Arrow with its members and wood which Gerard de Camville holds, the town of Greater Salford with its members which the prior of Kenilworth holds, the town of Abbot's Salford with its wood which the abbot of Evesham holds, the town of Weethley with its wood which Alexander de Abbetot holds.

And all the towns aforesaid and hamlets with their woods, wastes, and plains were afforested by the aforesaid king John to the damage of all the tenants above mentioned. And concerning this they say that in the first year of the coronation of the lord king Henry the great-grandfather of the lord king who now is, there was no forest in the county of Warwick, nor was any part of the forest of Feckenham in that county. But they say that a certain part of the town of Tardebigge, which the abbot of Bordsley holds, and which at the time of the coronation of the aforesaid lord king the great-grandfather of the lord king who now is, was in the county of Stafford, is now in this county. And this part extends along the king's highway which leads from the town of Bromsgrove towards the town of Alcester, from the brook which is called Wychibrook as far as Foxhunt Lydiate to the west of the same highway. But who afforested it, or in the time of what king that part was afforested, they know not.

And the jurors, on being asked how they know that the aforesaid lord king John afforested all the manors, towns, and hamlets aforesaid, say that they know by what their ancestors have related and by the common talk of the country.

In witness whereof the aforesaid jurors have put their seals to this perambulation.

XIV. (*a*).

AN INQUISITION CONCERNING THE BAILIWICK OF JOHN THE SON OF NIGEL IN THE FOREST OF BERNWOOD.

An inquisition made by the order of the lord king at Herteleye in the forest of Bernwood on the Saturday [3] next before the feast of St. Lawrence in the fiftieth year of the reign of king Henry the son of king John of this, that, whereas John the son of Nigel holds the bailiwick of the lord king's forest of Bernwood by hereditary right, the lord king wishes to be certified as to those things which belong to the same John by reason of the aforesaid bailiwick, and what sort of rights and customs he ought to have by reason of the aforesaid bailiwick, and what sort

debeat et cuiusmodi seruicia domino regi inde facere debeat, per sacramentum . . . .; qui dicunt super sacramentum suum quod predictus Iohannes filius Nigelli tenet iure hereditario de domino rege balliuam tocius foreste domini regis de Bernwode, scilicet, a la Stonyforde vsque ad quamdam aquam que vocatur la Burne que currit inter Stepel Cleyndon' et Padebury.

Et habet de iure racione predicte balliue cheminagium per totam predictam balliuam.

Idem habet et de iure habere debet per predictam balliuam racione eiusdem balliue ligna prostrata per ventum, quod quidam vocatur chableiz, et hoc in forma subscripta, scilicet, quod si ventus prosternat vna nocte uel vno die decem ligna dominus rex ea omnia habebit, si autem ventus prosternat vna nocte uel vno die minus quam decem ligna predictus Iohannes filius Nigelli habebit ea omnia.

Item idem Iohannes habet racione eiusdem balliue omnes coporones et zuchas de omnibus lignis que dominus rex dat uel vendit uel ad opus suum proprium capit in omnibus dominicis boscis suis infra predictam forestam.

[1] Item idem Iohannes habet de iure racione eiusdem balliue omnia attachiamenta et exitus attachiamentorum factorum de minuta spina, scilicet de tali spina, que non potest pati perforari de tarrera que vocatur Restnauegar.

Item idem habet et de iure habere debet racione eiusdem balliue retropannagium.

Item idem habet omnes nuces crescentes in omnibus dominicis boscis domini regis per totam predictam balliuam.

Item idem habet racione eiusdem balliue totum mortuum boscum in dominicis boscis domini regis infra dictam balliuam.

Et idem Iohannes filius Nigelli tenet de domino rege vnam hidam terre in Borstalle, que vocatur Derhide; et reddit inde domino regi per annum decem solidos.

Et pro omnibus aliis predictis rebus idem Iohannes custodit balliuam tocius predicte foreste et similiter pro eisdem rebus reddit domino regi per annum quadraginta solidos sterlingorum.

[1] Two passages similar to this occur in the Hundred Rolls, but they are incorrectly printed in *Rotuli Hundredorum*. The true readings are as follows:

'Item de subbosco intelligimus quod minute spine pertinent ad suam balliuam, que non possunt sustinere foramen unius tarere que uocatur restnauegar' (*Rotuli Hundredorum*, i. 22);

and,

'Dicunt quod idem I. habebit minutas spinas illas, scilicet, que non possunt pati tareram que uocatur restnaweger (*ibid.* i. 26).

of services he ought to do therefor to the lord king, by the oath of . . . . . who say upon their oath that the aforesaid John the son of Nigel holds of the lord king by hereditary right the bailiwick of all the lord king's forest of Bernwood, to wit from the Stonyford as far as a certain water which is called la Burne, which runs between Steeple Claydon and Padbury.

And he has of right by reason of the aforesaid bailiwick chiminage throughout all the aforesaid bailiwick.

He has and he ought of hereditary right to have throughout the aforesaid bailiwick by reason of the same bailiwick trees felled by the wind, which is called cablish, and that in the form underwritten, to wit, that, if the wind fells ten trees in one night and one day, the lord king will have them all, but if the wind fells less than ten trees in one night and one day, the aforesaid John the son of Nigel will have them all.

Also the same John has by reason of the same bailiwick all crops and roots from all trees which the lord king gives or sells or takes for his own use in all his demesne woods within the aforesaid forest.

Also the same John has of right by reason of the same bailiwick all attachments and issues of attachments made of small thorns, to wit, of such a thorn as cannot be perforated by an auger which is called 'Restnauegar.'

Also he has and of right ought to have by reason of the same bailiwick after-pannage.

Also he has all nuts growing in all the demesne woods of the lord king through all the aforesaid bailiwick.

Also he has by reason of the same bailiwick all the dead wood in the demesne woods of the lord king within the aforesaid bailiwick.

And the same John the son of Nigel holds of the lord king a hide of land in Boarstall, which is called Deerhide; and he renders ten shillings a year therefor to the lord king.

And for all the other aforesaid things the same John guards the bailiwick of all the aforesaid forest, and likewise for the same things he renders forty shillings sterling a year to the lord king.

XIV. (b).[1]

INQUISICIO DE BALLIUA ELYE DE TYNGEWYK' IN FORESTA DE WYTTLEWOD'.

Inquisicio facta apud Buk' die[2] Iouis proxima ante festum sancte Margarete anno regni regis Edwardi sexto coram Rogero[3] de Clifford, iusticiario foreste, per viridarios forestarie de Wyttlewod', Robertum Mauncel, Walterum de Fortho, Iohannem Gobyoun et Gilebertum de Morton' et viginti et quatuor tam milites quam alios de comitatu Buk' et Norhamt', videlicet, ...
que et cuiusmodi res ad balliuam Elye de Tyngewyk' in foresta de Wyttlewod' pertineant et qualiter et quibus condicionibus forestarii eam tenuerunt antequam dominus rex Henricus dedisset et concessisset eidem Elye balliuam foreste predicte et parci de Hanleye et qualiter prefatus Elyas eandem balliuam tenuit a tempore donacionis predicte; qui omnes iuratores dicunt per sacramentum suum quod Hugo[4] de Stratford quondam forestarius de feodo de balliua de Wakefeud reddidit per annum domino Iohanni[5] de Neuyle, tunc senescallo foreste, pro predicta balliua ad firmam duas marcas et dimidiam ad duos anni terminos, videlicet, ad festum sancti Michaelis et ad festum Anunciacionis beate Marie per equales porciones et duo quarteria nucium pro nucibus in dominico domini regis et triginta aucas et triginta gallinas et ducenta oua; et cepit tempore suo de villata de Deneshangere de qualibet virgata terre vnum quarterium auene pro claustura habenda ad blada sua, et pro mortuo bosco colligendo ad focum suum in dominico bosco domini regis; et de eadem villa cepit de qualibet domo vnam aucam et vnam gallinam per annum, et dedit eisdem hominibus housbote et heybote et clausturam circa blada sua sicut predictum est de dominico predicto.

Item idem Hugo habuit totum comodum de nucibus in dominico predicto per annum.

[1] *Inquisition. post mortem*, 6 Ed. i. No. 61.

[2] 14 July 1278.

[3] Roger of Clifford the younger was appointed justice of the forest south of Trent by letters patent dated 1 August 1270. See Fine Roll 67, m. 5.

[4] Hugh of Stratford and Wibert of Towcester lost their bailiwicks when Robert Passelewe was justice of the forest (see *Rotuli Hundredorum*, i. 31). As to the appointment of Robert Passelewe see p. 22, n. 2, above.

[5] John de Neville had the custody of the forest between the bridges of Stamford and Oxford for his life by the grant of his father Hugh, who also held it for life. John made fine with the king for having the bailiwick by three hundred marks in the month of July 1234. See Fine Roll 33, m. 6.

XIV. (*b*).[1]

AN INQUISITION CONCERNING THE BAILIWICK OF ELIAS OF TINGEWICK IN THE FOREST OF WHITTLEWOOD.

An inquisition made at Buckingham on the Thursday [2] next before the feast of St. Margaret in the sixth year of the reign of king Edward before Roger of Clifford, justice of the forest, by the verderers of the forest bailiwick of Whittlewood, Robert Maunsel, Walter of Furtho, John Gobyon, and Gilbert of Morton, and twenty-four as well knights as others of the counties of Buckingham and Northampton, to wit, ...
as to what and what sort of things belong to the bailiwick of Elias of Tingewick in the forest of Whittlewood and how and under what conditions the foresters held it before the lord king Henry gave and granted to the same Elias the bailiwick of the forest aforesaid and of the park of Handley; and how the aforesaid Elias held the same bailiwick from the time of the gift aforesaid; all which jurors say upon their oath that Hugh of Stratford, sometime forester in fee of the bailiwick of Wakefield, rendered to Sir John de Neville, then steward of the forest, as a farm for the aforesaid bailiwick two and a half marks a year at two terms of the year, to wit, at the feast of St. Michael and at the feast of the Annunciation of the Blessed Mary by equal portions, and two quarters of nuts for nuts in the demesne of the lord king and thirty geese and thirty hens and two hundred eggs; and he took in his time from the township of Denshanger for every virgate of land one quarter of wheat in return for their having paling for their corn and for collecting dead wood for their fuel in the demesne wood of the lord king; and from the same town he took from every house a goose and a hen in every year; and he gave to the same men housebote and haybote and paling to surround their corn, as has been before said, from the demesne aforesaid.

And the same Hugh had all the profit from the nuts in the demesne aforesaid in every year.

Item idem Hugo habuit retropannagium post festum sancti Martini, et fecit porcarios in foresta ad voluntatem suam.

Et cepit toto tempore suo de villa de Estpeir' et de Ierdele de qualibet virgata terre unam aucam et unam gallinam et quatuor denarios per annum et unum quarterium auene, de Westratford et de Toruestone duodecim denarios pro claustura et pro mortuo bosco habendo in dominico ut predictum est.

Et solebat colligere oua per totam balliuam suam de Wakefeld et solebat habere chiminagium per totam balliuam suam.

Et solebat habere totum mortuum boscum in balliua predicta et aueria sua propria pascencia per totam balliuam predictam.

Wibertus de Toucestre reddidit per annum predicto domino Iohanni de Neuill' pro balliua de Haselburwe decem solidos ad terminos predictos et habuit in ballia sua omnia uetera robora ad opus suum proprium. Et si dominus rex dedisset aliquam quercum in ballia sua, idem Wybertus habuit coporones inde.

Et habuit de qualibet domo in villa de Siresham unam gallinam ad Natale Domini et ad Pascha decem oua, et de Stratford' unum quarterium auene et de Torueston' duodecim denarios et retropannagium in ballia sua, et fecit porcarios in ballia sua ad voluntatem suam; et cepit nuces in dominico regis in ballia sua, et chiminagium in ballia sua in auxilium firme sue.

Dicunt eciam quod Elias[1] de Tingewyk' a tempore quo dominus Henricus rex sibi dedit balliuas predictas cepit chiminagium per totam balliuam suam et mortuum boscum ad vsos suos proprios in boscis regis et nuces in eisdem boscis cum acciderint preterquam in parco de Hanle et retropannagium post festum sancti Martini preterquam in parco de Hanle et custodiam porcorum et coporones de quercubus datis per regem in foresta preterquam in dicto parco, et vnam placeam que vocatur la Siche ad herbagium inter Shrobb' et Pokesle. Et habuit custodiam bosci de Seluestone et habere debet.

Et, ut intelligunt, ista que predictus Elias cepit pertinent ad custodiam ballie sue foreste predicte ad firmam predictam faciendam, quia idem Elias reddit firmam sicut predicti fecerunt, videlicet, duas marcas et dimidiam pro ballia de Wakefeld et decem solidos pro ballia de Haselberwe.

[1] The bailiwick of Whittlewood forest was granted to Elias of Tingewick for life by letters patent dated 11 December 1265. See Patent Roll 83, m. 37.

And the same Hugh had the after-pannage after the feast of St. Martin, and he made piggeries in the forest at his will.

And he took during all his time from the towns of East Pury and Yardley from every virgate of land a goose and a hen and four pence in every year and a quarter of oats; and from Weststratford and from Turweston twelve pence for paling and for having dead wood in the demesne, as has been before said.

And he was wont to collect eggs through all his bailiwick of Wakefield; and he was wont to have chiminage through all his bailiwick.

And he was wont to have all the dead wood in his bailiwick aforesaid, and to have his beasts of the plough pasturing over all the bailiwick aforesaid.

Wibert of Towcester rendered to the aforesaid John de Neville for his bailiwick of Hazelborough ten shillings a year at the aforesaid terms; and he had in his bailiwick all the old fuel trees for his own use. And if the lord king gave any oak in his bailiwick, the same Wibert had the crop thereof.

And he had from every house in the town of Syresham one hen at Christmas and ten eggs at Easter, and in Stratford a quarter of oats, and in Turweston twelve pence; and he had after-pannage in his bailiwick; and he made piggeries in his bailiwick at his will; and he took nuts in the demesne of the lord king in his bailiwick; and chiminage in his bailiwick in aid of his farm.

They say also that Elias of Tingewick, from the time when the lord king Henry gave to him the aforesaid bailiwicks, took chiminage through the whole of his bailiwick, and dead wood in the woods of the king for his own use; and nuts in the same woods, when there were any, except in the park of Handley; and after-pannage after the feast of St. Martin, except in the park of Handley; and the custody of pigs; and the crops of oaks which are given by the king in the forest, except in the said park; and a place which is called La Siche for herbage between Shrob and Puxley. And he had and ought to have the custody of the wood of Silverstone.

And, as they understand, those things which the aforesaid Elias took belong to the custody of his bailiwick of the forest aforesaid to make up the farm aforesaid because the same Elias renders a farm, as the aforesaid persons did, to wit two and a half marks for the bailiwick of Wakefield and ten shillings for the bailiwick of Hazelborough.

XV.[1]

Grauamina contra cartam de foresta.

Cum n*ost*re seynor le rey voyle e eyt comande e fet pupplier p*ar* sun conseyl ke la chartre de forest seyt tenue en tuz poyns en tuz articles saunz blemure, ces sunt les greuaunces dunt le puple e le commun de forests en Som*erset* se sentent greuez encuntre la chartre.

1. La ou la chartre dit ke tute la forests les queus le rey Henry ael le rey Henri fiz le rey Iohan afforesta seyent veus p*ar* bons e leus hommes, e si aukun boys autre ke le suen p*ro*pre eyt afforeste a damage celuy a ky le boys seyt, seyt desafforeste, e ke tuz les boys ke furent afforestes p*ar* le rey Richard ou p*ar* le rey Iohan dekes al p*re*mer coronement le rey Henry pere n*ost*re seynur le rey Edward seyent desafforestes vncore remeynent en forest encuntre la chartre en greuaunce del pays. Ces sunt les bundes[2] auncienes en tens le rey Henry pere le rey Richard e le rey Iohan sicu*m* la puraleye des auaundites forests n*us* dient de bunde en bunde. Et tuz les boys ke dehors sunt a greuaunce del pays e a graunt peche sunt afforestes kar le rey nat dehors nul demeyne ne nul p*ro*fit; mes le pays en est surcharge a g*ra*unt greuance de foresters et de lur garsons e de lur chiuaus, la ou le chef forester dust auer la charge pur les t*er*res e les tenemens ke il tent de rey.

2. E si vult la chartre ke erceueskes eueskes abbes priors cuntes baruns chiualers e fraunc tenanz ke boys vnt en forest eyent lur boys sicu*m* eus vrent al tens del premer coronement le rey Henry pere le rey Richard e Iohan issi ke il seyent q*ui*tes a tuz iurz de tutes purp*re*stures wasts e de assars fet en ices boys puys icel tens dekes al comencement del secund an del coronement le rey Henry fiz le rey Johan; a checune eyre de iustices de forest si sunt la gent, ke boys vnt en forest greuement punys pur purp*re*sture wasts e assars del auantdit tens.

[1] *Forest Proceedings, Ancient Chancery*, No. 101. This is a file of several skins. The text as above printed is from the sixth skin of the file. There is another copy of it on the second skin of the same file; but the readings on the two skins differ in no particular of importance.

[2] The grievances here printed are written in the original immediately after a perambulation of the forest in Somerset made in January $127\frac{8}{9}$, in which the boundaries are set out in detail.

XV.

Grievances against the charter of the forest.

Whereas our lord the king wishes and has commanded and caused to be published by his council that the charter of the forest be observed in all respects in all its articles without blemish, these are the grievances, whereby the people and the commonalty of the forests in Somerset feel themselves aggrieved against the charter.

1. Although the charter says that all the forests which king Henry grandfather of the king Henry the son of king John afforested are to be viewed by good and lawful men, and if he has afforested any wood other than his own to the damage of him to whom the wood belongs, it is to be disafforested; and that all the woods which were afforested by king Richard or by king John before the first coronation of king Henry father of our lord the king Edward are to be disafforested, yet they still remain in the forest against the charter to the grievance of the country. The above are the ancient bounds in the time of king Henry the father of the king Richard and the king John, as the perambulation of the aforesaid forests tells us, from bound to bound. And all the woods, which are outside, to the grievance of the country and most sinfully have been afforested, for the king has outside no demesne and no profit; moreover the country is surcharged thereby most grievously with foresters and their pages and their horses, although the chief forester ought to be charged with them in return for the lands and tenements which he holds of the king.

2. And though the charter says that archbishops, bishops, abbots, priors, earls, barons, knights and free tenants, who have woods in the forest, may have their woods as they were at the time of the first coronation of the king Henry father of the king Richard and John, so that they may be quit for ever of all purprestures wastes and assarts made in those woods since that time till the commencement of the second year of the coronation of the king Henry the son of king John, yet at every eyre of the justices of the forest are the people who have woods in the forest grievously punished for purprestures wastes and assarts of the aforesaid time.

3. La ou la chartre dit ke veue de espeutison de chens deyt estre fet de terz an en terz an q*ua*unt len fet le regard e dunke p*ar* veue de leus hommes e de bons e nemye autrement la veynent les foresters p*ar* my les viles cornant, e funt noyse a graunt bruyt pur fere les mastins venir hors a boyer eus, si attachent la bone gent de an en an pur lur mastins si les trez ortils ne seyent copes, e vne maylle de la pelote del pe destre v la chartre dit ke les tres ortils seyent trenchez saunz la pelote del pe deuaunt.

4. La ou la chartre dit ke par veue e p*ar* serment de duze regardurs q*ua*unt il funt lur regard taunt foresters seyent mis a forest garder taunt cu*m* il verrunt renablement suffire, la met le chef forester les foresters [de] suz ly a chiual e a pe a suen voler saunz la veue de nuly e plus ke ne suffist a garder la forest dreyturele par le lur donaunt sicu*m* il puent finir pur auer baylye a graunt damage e a greuaunce del pays pur le surcharge de eus e de lur chiuaus e de lur garsons, la ou le rey nat nul pru ne nul demeyne fors vn boys, ke est apele Brucumbe en Celewode; e la prent pur herbage de cel boys de vile voysines p*ar* deus soz tres soz q*ua*tre soz la ou nul dener ne dust estre pur herbage solum la chartre pris.

5. La ou la chartre dit ke nul forester ne bedel ne face escotale ne ne quile garbes ne aueyne ne autre ble ne ayneus ne purceus, ne autre quillette ne face, la veynent les foresters en Aust et quillent tute man*er*e de ble en garbes oveke lur chiual dedenz bundes de forest e dehors p*re*s de forest, e dunkes il funt lur cerveyse de cele quillette, e ceus ke la ne veynent beyure e donent den*er*s a lur volente maleme*n*t sunt punys a lur ples pur mortboys, la ou le rey nat nul demeyne; ne nul nose bracer q*ua*unt il bracent ne c*er*ueyse vendre taunt cu*m* il vnt nule man*er*e de c*er*ueyse a vendre; e ce fet checun forester seuereaume*n*t p*ar* an a g*ra*nt greuaunce del pays.

6. E estre ce il quilent aygneus e purceus leyne e lyn de checune meyson ou ilia leyne vne tuyson e en [1] le meyns defendu de checune meyson vn den*er* ou de checun porc vn ferling. E qu*a*nt il bracent si abatent arbres a lur fouayle en boys de bone gent saunz lur cunge, ce est a sauer, kennes, arables, coudres, espines des plus beles auaunt, dunt les bone gent se sentent greue pur la destruccion de lur boys;

[1] This and the three following words seem to represent the Latin 'in mense uetito.'

3. Although the charter says that view of the lawing of dogs ought to be made every third year, when the regard is made, and then by view of loyal men and good, and not otherwise, yet the foresters come through the towns blowing horns and make a nuisance with much noise to cause the mastiffs to come out to bark at them; and so they attach the good folk every year for their mastiffs if the three toes be not cut and a little piece from the ball of the right foot, although the charter says that the three toes are to be cut but not the ball of the fore foot.

4. Although the charter says that by view and by oath of twelve regarders, when they make their regard, as many foresters are to be set to guard the forest as to them shall seem reasonably sufficient, yet the chief forester sets foresters beneath him, riding and walking, at his pleasure without the view of anybody, and more than are sufficient to guard the lawful forest, in return for their giving as much as they can to make fine for having their bailiwicks, to the great damage and grievance of the country because of the surcharge of them and their horses and their pages, although the king has no profit and no demesne, except one wood which is called Brucombe in Selwood; and he takes there for herbage of that wood from the neighbouring towns sometimes two shillings, sometimes three shillings, or sometimes four shillings, although no money ought to be taken for herbage according to the charter.

5. Although the charter says that no forester or beadle shall make scotale or collect sheaves or oats or other corn, or lambs or little pigs, or shall make any other collection, yet the foresters come with horses at harvest time and collect every kind of corn in sheaves within the bounds of the forest and outside near the forest, and then they make their ale from that collection, and those who do not come there to drink and do not give money at their will are sorely punished at their pleas for dead wood, although the king has no demesne; nor does anyone dare to brew when the foresters brew, nor to sell ale so long as the foresters have any kind of ale to sell; and this every forester does year by year to the great grievance of the country.

6. And besides this they collect lambs and little pigs, wool, and flax, from every house where there is wool a fleece, and in fence month from every house a penny, or for each pig a farthing. And when they brew, they fell trees for their fuel in the woods of the good people without leave, to wit, oaks, maples, hazels, thorns, felling the best first, whereby the good people feel themselves aggrieved on account of the destruction of their woods; nor does any free man

ne nul fraunc homme ne ose attacher nul mesfesur en sun boys demeyne si ne seyt *par* forester iure. Apres le Aust veynent les foresters a chiual e quilent ble *par* bussel *par* deus *par* tres *par* q*ua*tre solum ce ke il seyent hommes eyses e en memes la man*er*e funt lur c*er*ueyse cu*m* les foresters a pe a g*ra*nt greuaunce del pays.

Ce est le p*re*sentement de la forest de Menedepe de lur greuaunce.

7. La ou le chartre dit ke nul swanimot desoremes ne seyt tenu fors treys fez *par* an en le regne; ce est a sauer a comencement de q*ui*nze iurs deuant la feste seynt Michel q*ua*nt les agisturs asembler*en*t de agister le demeyne boys le rey, e encur la feste seynt Martyn q*ua*nt les agisters deyuent receure le pannage le rey; a ces deus swanimos asembler*en*t foresters vertders, agisturs e nul autre *par* destresse; la vent le chef forester et fet somondre tuz les frauncs tenanz dedenz forest de venir devaunt ly e de checune vile q*ua*tre hommes e le dizener, e si il ne veynent curu*nt* a defautes a g*ra*unt greuaunce del pays, la ou le rey nat nul demeyne ne nul pru de celes defautes. E le terz swanimot deyt estre tenu au comencement de q*ui*nze iurs deuaunt la feste seynt Iohain le Baptiste pur la feoneson de bestes le rey; e a cel swanimot tenir vendrunt foresters e vertders e nul autre *par* destresse. E la fet le forester la somo*n*se e curt a defautes sicum il est auaunt dit. E estre ce a checun q*ua*rante iurs *par* tut lan si fet la somonse de francs e de vilees sicum il est auant dit hors de demeyne le roy a g*ra*unt greuaunce del pays; e dit ke il vent fere enquestes la ou il nia nule beste morte ne mayne ne nul lel enditement de forester ne de autre homme c*er*teyn solum le assise de forest.

8. La ou la chartre dit ke nul forester ke ne seyt forester de fe rendant ferme al rey pur sa baylye ne deyt p*re*ndre nul cheminage en sa baylye, le forester de Menedepe e de Celewode en Som*erset* ne rent nule ferme al rey ne nul cheminage ne prent, mes il prent pys, dunt le pays se sent greue ou le rey nat nul pru, kar ce est hors de son demeyne la attachent il checun riche e poure dedenz forest manaunt oueke mortboys e oueke sec e prent de poures de checun siz den*er*s ke portent sur lur dos e de riches solum ce ke il vnt g*ra*ce de finir.

dare to attach any evil doer in his demesne wood, unless it be by a sworn forester. After harvest the riding foresters come and collect corn by the bushel, sometimes two bushels, sometimes three bushels, sometimes four bushels, according to the people's means; and in the same way they make their ale, as do the walking foresters, to the great grievance of the country.

This is the presentment of the forest of Mendip of their grievances.

7. Although the charter says that no swanimote henceforth is to be held in the realm, except three times a year, to wit, at the beginning of the fifteen days before the feast of St. Michael, when the agisters meet to agist the demesne woods of the king, and about the feast of St. Martin, when the agisters ought to receive the king's pannage, and that at these two swanimotes the foresters, verderers, agisters, and none other shall come by distress, yet the chief forester comes and causes all the free tenants within the forest to be summoned to come before him, and from each town four men and the tithing man, and if they do not come they incur defaults to the great grievance of the country, although the king has no demesne and has no profit from those defaults. And the third swanimote ought to be held at the commencement of the fifteen days before the feast of St. John the Baptist for the fawning of the king's beasts; and to hold this swanimote the foresters and verderers shall come and none others by distress. And yet the forester makes the summons, and people incur defaults, as is before said. And besides this every forty days throughout the year the summons is made of the free men and townships, as is before said, outside the king's demesnes, to the great grievance of the country; and he says that they come to make inquests, although there is no beast dead or maimed, nor any lawful indictment by a forester or any other certain man according to the assize of the forest.

8. Although the charter says that no forester who is not a forester in fee rendering farm to the king for his bailiwick ought to take any chiminage in his bailiwick, yet the foresters of Mendip and of Selwood in Somerset render no farm to the king nor take chiminage, but they take worse, whereby the country feels itself aggrieved, without the king having any profit, for it is outside his demesne; for they attach every man, rich and poor, dwelling within the forest with dead wood and with dry wood; and from the poor they take, from every man who carries wood upon his back six pence, and from the rich as much as they have

Les foresters a chiual e foresters a pe e lur garsons *pre*nent telement en coste de charette deuz soz trez soz *qua*tre soz de akun plus de akun meyns solum ce ke il est eyse e de chiual ke porte summage duze den*er*s diz e vyt den*er*s sezze den*er*s *pur* leuer lur fin ke il vnt fet a lur chef forester a *gra*unt destruccion de la forest le rey e a greuaunce de ces ke boys ont en forest kar il le suffrent aler *qui*te *par* tut le an saunz attachement ou le rey nat nul pru.

9. La ou la chartre dit que ryen ne seyt pris for de ceus ke meynent hors de sa baylye e ke ryen ne seyt pris de ceus ke portent sus lur dos buche escorche ou carbon, ia seyt il ce ke de ce viuent e si dit la chartre ke nul cheminage ne deyt estre done fors de demeyne boys le rey, la ou le gent se reposent oueske lur buche ou merym e abatent de charettes hors del clos de la franchise de Charthuse en my les vile e rep*re*nent autre fez lur summage de memes cel boys ou merym, les foresters les attachent e les amercyent greuement a lur volente saunz reyson.

Exemore.

10. Les foresters attachent ausi ben le bone gent en lur demeyne boys e en lur demeyne t*er*res e les am*er*cient greuement e la meyne gent attachent il a lur hostels e en lur hayes e en lur croftes en my les viles; e les hummes ke meynourent en lur wastine pur fere houys a semer ble, la ou le rey nat nul demeyne, les foresters les attachent deuaunt eus ; e dient ke il vnt fet wast e purp*re*sture si il ne funt lur volente pur pes auer, e de checun homme t*er*re tenaunt volent il auer la pel de vn aygnel ou une mayle e dient ke ce est lur fe.

11. E si vn homme meyne le merym de vne meyson de cent anz ou plus ou mey*n*s de vn lyu dekes a vn autre de quel lyu ke il vyenge de hors forest ou de dens ou vne vyelle huche saunz fer,[1] ou vne pere de rous a char ou a charette sicum marchans funt uers fere,[2] dequel lyu ke il vyengent, il les attachent en my le real chemyn e akune fez en my le marche ausicu*m* pur cheminnage deke ataunt ke il eyent fini a lur volente dunt le pays se sent mult greue. E prient n*ost*re seynor le rey ke totes choses e teles greuaunces seyent amendez sicu*m* le rey de cetes choses nat nul pru.

[1] This word is so spelt on both skins. It is possible, however, that 'fere' or 'feyre' is intended, in which case the translation might be 'where there is no fair.'

[2] This word is spelt as 'feyre' on the second skin.

fortune to make fine. The foresters, riding and walking, and their pages take likewise with respect to a cart two shillings, three shillings, four shillings, from some more and from others less, according to their means, and from a horse which carries a load twelve pence, eighteen pence and sixteen pence to raise their fine which they have made with their chief forester, to the great destruction of the forest of the king, and to the grievance of those who have woods in the forest, for they suffer the carriers to go quit all through the year without attachment and yet the king has no profit.

9. Although the charter says that nothing shall be taken except from those who carry wood outside the bailiwicks of the foresters, and that nothing shall be taken from those who carry upon their backs wood, bark, or charcoal even though they live thereby, and though the charter says that no chiminage is to be given except from the demesne wood of the king, yet where the people rest with their wood or timber and unload it from carts outside the close of the franchise of the Charterhouse among the towns, and afterwards take up their loads of this same wood or timber, the foresters attach them and amerce them grievously at their will without right.

Exmoor.

10. The foresters attach likewise the good folk in their demesne woods and in their demesne lands and amerce them grievously and the small folk they attach at their homes and in their enclosures and in their crofts among the towns; and the men who work in their waste ground at making 'hoes' to sow corn, although the king has no demesne, these their foresters attach to come before them; and they say that they have made waste and purpresture, if they do not their will, for having peace; and from each man holding land they will have the skin of a lamb or a farthing; and they say that that is their fee.

11. And if a man bring the timber of a house a hundred years old, be it more or less, from one place to another, from whatsoever place it come, without or within the forest, or an old chest without iron, or a pair of wheels for a waggon or a cart, as merchants are wont to do to a fair, from whatsoever place they come they attach them in the middle of the king's highway and sometimes in the middle of the market as if for chiminage until they have made fine at their will, whereby the country feels itself much aggrieved. And they pray our lord the king that all such things and grievances may be amended, seeing that the king from such things has no profit.

XVI.[1]

PLACITA FORESTE APUD HUNTYNDONE IN OCTABIS[2] NATIUITATIS SANCTI IOHANNIS BAPTISTE ANNO REGNI REGIS EDWARDI QUARTODECIMO CORAM ROGERO EXTRANEO, PETRO DE LENCHE ET IOHANNE FILIO NIGELLI IUSTICIARIIS AD EADEM PLACITA AUDIENDA ET TERMINANDA ASSIGNATIS.

. . . .

[3]Placita warenne[4] de Cantebrigge apud Huntedon';

presentata per Robertum de Cadamo, Ricardum Aubyn, Robertum de Houcton', Thomam le Freman, Radulfum Giffard, Henricum Champioun, Stephanum Katerine, Iohannem de le Howes, Rogerum filium Thome, Willelmum Chaumpeneys, Robertum Katerine, Willelmum Payne et Iohannem de Grantesteyde.

Philippus de Coleuile et familiares sui, quorum nomina ignorantur, cum leporariis eiusdem Philippi consueti fuerunt intrare warennam domini regis de Cantebrigge, et capere lepores in eadem sine waranto tempore regis Henrici vsque ad obitum suum et eciam tempore domini regis nunc vsque ad annum regni sui duodecimum. Idem Philippus non venit nec fuit attachiatus. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eum venire apud Huntedon' die[5] Martis in carniprivio. Qui non
x libre venit. Ideo de eo decem libre.

Henricus filius Henrici de Chylderle, qui habet terras in comitatu Cantebrigg', consuetus fuit fugare et capere[6] lepores in warenna predicta cum leporariis predicti patris sui, qui mortuus est, tempore regis Henrici vsque ad obitum suum. Idem Henricus non venit nec fuit attachiatus. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat eum venire ad diem predictum. Qui non venit. Ideo de eo una marca.

Robertus filius Rogeri, clericus, de episcopatu Norwycen' et London', tempore quo fuit scolaris vniuersitatis Cantebrig', videlicet, tempore regis Henrici et eciam tempore regis Edwardi usque ad annum regni sui duodecimum per aduentus suos apud Cantebrigg', et familiares sui consueti fuerunt intrare warennam predictam cum

[1] *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, No. 44.
[2] 1 July 1286.
[3] Roll 3.
[4] This warren was appurtenant to the castle of Cambridge. Its boundaries are recorded on the Hundred Rolls (see *Rotuli Hundredorum*, vol. ii. p. 406).
[5] 25 February 128$\frac{6}{7}$.
[6] MS. 'carpere.'

XVI.

PLEAS OF THE FOREST AT HUNTINGDON ON THE OCTAVE[2] OF THE NATIVITY OF ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST IN THE FOURTEENTH YEAR OF THE REIGN OF KING EDWARD BEFORE ROGER L'ESTRANGE, PETER OF LENCH AND JOHN FITZ NIGEL JUSTICES ASSIGNED FOR HEARING AND DETERMINING THE SAME PLEAS.

. . . .

Pleas of the warren of Cambridge at Huntingdon;

presented by Robert de Caen, Richard Aubyn, Robert of Houghton, Thomas Freeman, Ralph Giffard, Henry Champiun, Stephen Catherine, John de le Howes, Roger the son of Thomas, William Champeneys, Robert Catherine, William Pain and John of Grantesteyde.

Philip de Colleville and his servants, whose names are not known, were wont to enter the lord king's warren of Cambridge, with the greyhounds of the same Philip, and to take hares in the same without warrant in the time of king Henry until his death, and also in the time of the lord king who now is, until the twelfth year of his reign. The same Philip did not come, nor was he attached; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause him to come at Huntingdon on the first Tuesday[5] in Lent. And he did not come; therefore of him ten pounds.

Henry the son of Henry of Childerley, who has lands in the county of Cambridge, was wont to hunt and take hares in the aforesaid warren with the greyhounds of his aforesaid father, who is dead, in the time of king Henry until his death. The same Henry did not come, nor was he attached; therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause him to come at the day aforesaid. And he did not come; therefore of him one mark.

Robert the son of Roger, a clerk of the bishoprics of Norwich and London, at the time when he was a scholar in the university of Cambridge, to wit, in the time of king Henry and also in the time of king Edward till the twelfth year of his reign, and used to come to Cambridge, and his servants were wont to enter the aforesaid warren

leporariis suis et fugare et capere lepores in eadem, vnde certus numerus non potest inquiri. Et non venit nec fuit attachiatus. x libre Ideo de eo decem libre.

Magister Adam le Fraunceys de episcopatu Dunel', tempore quo fuit scolaris Cantebrigg', consuetus fuit cum familiaribus et leporariis suis intrare warennam predictam et cum pluribus aliis clericis quorum nomina ignorantur, et fugare et capere lepores in eadem warenna vnde certus numerus non potest inquiri; et magnum dampnum et destruccionem fecit de leporibus in eadem. Postea ponitur in respectum respectum vsque ad parliamentum a die Pasche in vnum mensem.

Willelmus de Shepy clericus de episcopatu Elyen' (c sol.), Willelmus de Bibbesworth' clericus de epicopatu Linc' (c sol.), Magister Thomas de Middelton, archidiaconus Norwyc' (respectus), Hugo de la Penne, clericus de episcopatu Linc' (l sol.), Iacobus de Moun de episcopatu Bathon' (c sol.), Thomas filius Alani clericus de episcopatu Dulmon' uel de archiepiscopatu Ebor' (c sol.), et Willelmus de Dunfraunuile clericus de episcopatu Dulmonen' (c sol.), temporibus quibus fuerunt scolares vniuersitatis Cantebr', sepius intrauerant warennam predictam cum leporariis suis; et sepius miserunt homines suos in eandem warennam cum leporariis suis et fugauerunt et ceperunt plures lepores, quilibet pro parte sua, vnde numerus non potest inquiri.

De Thoma de Middelton' ponitur in respectum quia est vltra mare in seruicio domini regis.

coram rege Willelmus de Brumpton et Willelmus de Saham, iusticiarii, et familiares eorum per aduentus suos apud Cantebrigg' tempore regis nunc, videlicet, ante annum regni sui duodecimum, consueti fuerunt intrare warennam predictam cum leporariis suis et fugare et capere lepores sine waranto; set quot non potest inquiri.

Iohannes Extraneus dominus de Middilton', Warinus de Insula, dominus de Ramton' et templarii de Daneye clamant habere libertatem warenne in terris suis infra warennam predictam domini regis; et sepius cum leporariis suis ceperunt plures lepores in eisdem terris suis pro voluntate sua. Et fuerunt magistri predicte domus de Daneye, de quibus recolitur modo, per aliquod tempus Iurdanus de Thame, qui adhuc est in eadem domo, et Willelmus de Skotowe qui nunc est preceptor ibidem. Ideo preceptum est vicecomiti quod faciat venire predictos Iohannem et Warinum et eciam preceptorem ad ostendendum warantum si quod inde habeant, uel ad satisfaciendum

with their greyhounds and to hunt and take hares in the same, the precise number of which cannot be ascertained. And he did not come, nor was he attached; therefore of him ten pounds.

Master Alan le Fraunceis of the bishopric of Durham, at the time when he was a scholar at Cambridge, was wont, with his servants and greyhounds, to enter the warren aforesaid and, with many other clerks, whose names are not known, was wont to hunt and take hares in the same warren, whereof the precise number cannot be ascertained; and he caused great damage and destruction to the hares in the same warren. Afterwards the matter is respited till the parliament a month after Easter.

William of Sheepy, clerk, of the bishopric of Ely, William of Bibsworth, clerk, of the bishopric of Lincoln, Master Thomas of Middleton, archdeacon of Norwich, Hugh de la Penne, clerk, of the bishopric of Lincoln, James de Moyon of the bishopric of Bath, Thomas the son of Alan, clerk, of the bishopric of Durham or of the archbishopric of York, and William d'Umfraville, clerk, of the bishopric of Durham, at the times when they were scholars at the university of Cambridge frequently entered the warren aforesaid with their greyhounds; and they frequently sent their men into the same warren with their greyhounds; and they hunted and took many hares, each taking his share; and the number thereof cannot be ascertained.

Concerning Thomas of Middleton the matter is respited, because he is beyond the sea in the service of the lord king.

William of Brompton and William of Saham, justices, and their servants, when they used to come to Cambridge in the time of the lord king, who now is, to wit, before the twelfth year of his reign, were wont to enter the warren aforesaid with their greyhounds and to hunt and take hares without warrant; but how many they took cannot be ascertained.

John l'Estrange, lord of Middleton, Warin de l'Isle, lord of Rampton and the Templars of Denney claim to have the franchise of warren in their lands within the lord king's warren aforesaid; and they frequently took with their greyhounds many hares in the same lands at their pleasure. And the masters of the aforesaid house of Denney, of whom it is now remembered, were Jordan of Thame for some time, who is still in the same house, and William of Skottowe, who now is preceptor there. Therefore the sheriff is ordered to cause the aforesaid John and Warin and also the preceptor to come and show their warrant if they have any thereof, or to make satisfaction

domino regi de transgressione predicta citra mensem a die Pasche proximum futurum uel tunc in parliamento Lond'; aut eciam extunc plene satisfaciant domino regi.

Abbas de Rames' clamat currere cum leporariis suis in terris suis in manerio de Gretton' infra predictam warennam. Qui venit et ostendit cartam per quam conceditur ei quod habeat warennam in tota terra sua de Hurstingestonhundred et in alia terra sua in bosco et in plano. Et testificatum est quod ea semper in pace hucusque vsus est. Ideo quietus.

Familiares Fulconi de Penebrugg', persone de Staunton', consueti fuerunt intrare warennam cum leporariis eiusdem persone et fugare et capere lepores in eadem vsque ad annum regis Edwardi duodecimum. Qui non venit. Ideo de eo decem marce. x marce.

xx sol. Iohannes de Lay (xx sol.) consuetus est intrare warennam cum leporariis suis et capere lepores sine waranto.

[1] Adhuc de warenna Cantebrugg'.

iiij sol. Eustachius de Cotes (ii sol.) et quidam Gosse (ii sol.) socius suus consueti sunt intrare warennam cum rethibus et capere pluuerios et huiusmodi [2] volatilia. Et non venerunt nec fuerunt attachiati.

dimidia marca. ij sol. Laurencius' Seman de Cantbrig' (dimidia marca) et Michaelis Scripe de Bernewelle (ij sol.), consueti sunt intrare warennam cum rethibus et sewell' et capere volatilia. Qui non fuerunt attachiati. Ideo in misericordia.

Homines et familiares Ricardi abbatis de Croylande qui nunc est per adventus suos apud Cotenham, videlicet ante annum regis Edwardi duodecimum consueti fuerunt intrare warennam cum leporariis eiusdem abbatis et fugare et capere lepores in eadem. Ideo de predicto Abbate decem libre. x libre.

Willelmus de Rothinge, tempore quo fuit vicecomes, et familiares sui cum leporariis eiusdem fugauerunt et ceperunt lepores in warenna predicta. Ideo de eo decem libre. x libre.

De Leonio Dennyng pro transgressione in warenna predicta, una marca.

De Thoma Bakun de Lanbeche, Henrico le Keu, Rogero Flet et Henrico Bolby pro transgressione volatilium cum rethibus in warenna predicta.[3]

[1] Roll 3 in dorso. [2] MS. huius. [3] The penalty is not specified in the roll.

to the lord king concerning the trespass aforesaid, before the expiration of one month from Easter next to come, or at the date of such expiration in the parliament at London ; or even after that date let him make full satisfaction to the lord king.

The Abbot of Ramsey claims to hunt with his greyhounds in his lands in the manor of Girton within the aforesaid warren ; and he comes and shows a charter by which it is granted to him that he may have warren in all his land in the hundred of Hurstingstone, and in his other lands in wood and plain. And it is witnessed that he has hitherto always enjoyed it in peace ; therefore he is quit.

The servants of Fulk of Penbridge, parson of Stanton, were wont to enter the warren with the greyhounds of the same parson, and to hunt and take hares in the same till the twelfth year of king Edward ; and he did not come ; therefore of him ten marks.

John de Lay is wont to enter the warren with his greyhounds and to take hares without warrant.

As yet of the warren of Cambridge.

Eustace of Cotes and a certain Gosse, his fellow, were wont to enter the warren with nets and to take plovers and such like wildfowl. And they did not come, nor were they attached.

Laurence Seman of Cambridge and Michael Scrippe of Barnwell, were wont to enter the warren with nets and scarecrows and to take wildfowl. And they were not attached ; therefore they are in mercy.

The men and servants of Richard the abbot of Crowland, who now is, when they used to come to Cottenham, to wit, before the twelfth year of king Edward were wont to enter the warren with the greyhounds of the same abbot and to hunt and take hares in the same ; therefore of the aforesaid abbot ten pounds.

William of Roding, when he was sheriff, and his servants with his greyhounds hunted and took hares in the warren aforesaid ; therefore of him ten pounds.

Of Leon Denning for trespass in the warren aforesaid one mark.

Of Thomas Bakun of Landbeach, Henry le Keu, Roger Flet and Henry Bolby for trespassing against the wildfowl with nets in the warren aforesaid.

GLOSSARY.

amessiare, to let slip. The word, which is not common, is always used of greyhounds. It occurs not less than three times in a roll of inquisitions of the years 19 to 22 Ed. i. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec. No.* 82). Thus:

> amessiauit predictos leporarios ad predictum yourum per mediam uillam (*m.* 3).
>
> amessiauerunt leporarios suos ad unam herdam damorum (*m.* 3).
>
> amessiauerunt leporarios ad tres damos (*m.* 7).

The form 'amessare' was also in use (see *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 45, *Roll* 7 *d*).

arabilis, a maple (*M.F.* érable). Towards the close of the fourteenth century the word was becoming obsolete, its place being taken by the English 'maple.' Thus in an inquisition of 37 Ed. iii. we have 'arbores uocate mapeles' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 279, *m.* 9). And in Patent Roll of 5 Ric. ii., the words 'quercus wodappiltre et mappill' occur (*Patent Roll* 312, *m.* 10). The maple occurs more frequently than most other English trees in documents of the thirteenth century. In the *Statutes of the Realm*, i. p. 243, 'arabilis' is wrongly translated as 'arable.'

belongus (p. 80), slantwise.

> Wlnerauerunt M. f. . . . cum una sagitta sub mamilla sinistra ad profunditatem unius palme de belongo.

This passage should be compared with the following extract from *Miracles de Saint Louis*:

> et estoit la plaie ausi come roonde i petitet bellongue et si parfonde que len pooit veoir aucune foiz les ners du braz et lee si come la laieur de braz le pooit soufrir. (Bouquet, *Historiens de la France*, Tome xx. p. 188).

The following is an extract from the Complément of the *Dict. de l'Académie Française* (ed. 1847):

> *Belonc* (*de*). adv. (V. lang.) De travers, de biais. 'Tout alla de travers et belonc' (*Eust. Deschamps*).

bernarius, a berner, a person in charge of the hounds called 'canes currentes,' or 'running hounds.' Numerous entries on the Close Rolls of Ed. ii. tend to show that when the king sent his hunters into the forests to procure venison they were accompanied by berners in charge of running hounds, fewterers in charge of greyhounds, and sometimes bercelleters in charge of bercelets. Thus:

> cum mittamus I. L. cum xxiiij canibus currentibus sex leporariis duobus bernariis et uno ueutrario ad capiendam pinguedinem . . . tibi (*Close Roll* 133, *m.* 1).
>
> cum nos nuper uenatorem nostrum T. de B. . . . cum duobus bernariis nostris, uno ueutrario et uno kaceken et triginta canibus currentibus et nouem leporariis . . . misissemus (*Close Roll* 154, *m.* 27).
>
> cum mittamus dilectum uallettum nostrum R. L. uenatorem nostrum cum

duobus bernariis duobus ueutrariis uno bercelettario uiginti et quatuor canibus currentibus decem leporariis et duobus bercelettis ad perhendinandum infra balliuam tuam (*Close Roll* 136, *m.* 7).

In the second example the word 'kaceken' corresponds to the modern 'chassechien.' There were different breeds of running hounds, such as **canes cueruericii**, **canes damericii**, **canes haericii**, and **canes lutericii**. The berners attached to a pack of 'canes damericii' were called 'bernarii damericii,' and those to a pack of 'canes haericii' were called 'bernarii haericii'; thus in some letters close of 7 January 131$\frac{4}{5}$ we have:

Cum mittamus . . . I. L. et R. L. cum duobus bernariis haericiis quatuor ueutrariis uno bercelletario duobus bernariis daemericiis et quadraginta et octo canibus currentibus decem et octo leporariis et duobus bercelletis ad capiendas quadraginta damas de fermesona (*Close Roll* 137, *m.* 22).

In this case the forty-eight running hounds must have consisted partly of 'canes haericii' and partly of 'canes damericii.' See also the last example under the word **ualtrarius** in this Glossary.

The passages quoted do not of themselves prove that in the reign of Ed. ii. the berners had no concern with the greyhounds, but as we repeatedly find fewterers in charge of the greyhounds alone and never in charge of running hounds alone, there can be little doubt on the point (see **ualtrarius**, below).

In the reign of John, however, it seems that berners were sometimes in charge of 'canes de mota' and braches. Thus in some letters close of 1 September 1212 we have:

Mittimus ad te cc et xl leporarios nostros cum lvj ualtrariis eorum custodibus. Mittimus eciam ad te W. f. R., W. V., et R. de S. mandantes quatinus eisdem leporariis et ualtrariis et canibus nostris de motis et brachettis cum eorum bernariis . . . necessaria inuenias (*Rot. Litt Claus.* i. 123).

The 'canes de mota' were probably the same as the 'canes currentes.'

bersa (p. 2). There is considerable doubt as to what this word means, but it seems to be nearly synonymous with 'haya,' which may mean a piece of enclosed ground or the fence which enclosed a piece of ground. In a charter granted by King John on 30 May 1205 the following words occur:

pasturam quadraginta uaccarum cum uitulis suis donec habeant unum annum et duorum taurorum per totam bersam nostram in foresta nostra de Chipeham (*Rot. Cart.* p. 152).

Again, in *Testa de Nevill* (p. 43, *a*), we have:

Ricardus Strechte tenet duas uirgatas per serianciam ad custodiendam bersam domini regis in foresta in partibus illis.

The word also occurs in some letters close of 2 October 1216:

Mandamus uobis quod non permittatis quod milites quibus uicecomes Norhamt' terras assignauit in foresta nostra aliquid uendant de boscis ubi dominicas chaceas et bersas nostras et defensam nostram habere consueuimus (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 290).

The words 'cum bersa' on p. 98 are perhaps an error for 'cum berseletto,' but they may mean 'with the aid of an enclosure.'

bersare (p. 65), to shoot. In Du Cange's *Glossarium* this word is translated by 'uenari.' It certainly did not bear that meaning in England in the thirteenth century. Expressions such as 'bersatum in femore dextro' (p. 87) are common; and no use of it which suggests the meaning of 'to hunt' instead of 'to shoot' has been cited.

bersatores (p. 10), although properly meaning 'persons shooting,' may be conveniently translated as 'poachers.'

berselettus (p. 110), a bercelet, a hound which hunted by scent. The word is a diminutive of 'bersellus,' which was probably a hound of the same nature, but of a larger size. In the Worcester eyre roll of 1271 we have:

Idem R. habet quandam leporariam sequentem ipsum per forestam, et cum bersauerit aliquam feram, illa leporaria sequitur illam feram quasi berseletus quousque inuenerit et ceperit eam (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 229, *Roll* 7).

The bercelet was sometimes described as a brach. In *Testa de Nevill*, the following passage occurs:

> Umfridus de Monte [tenet] manerium de Whitefeld cum pertinenciis per serianciam affectandi unum bracketum ad opus domini regis cum ipse dominus rex preceperit ad currendum ad ceruum et bissam et damum et damam (p. 28, *a*).

The corresponding entry in the Hundred Rolls is as follows:

> Et sciendum quod dominus Henricus rex proauus regis nunc dictum manerium dedit cuidam Philippo de Monte per seruicium afeytandi quemdam berselettum (*Rot. Hund.* ii. p. 6).

Again, on the Close Roll of 3 Ed. ii. we have:

> R. de B. defunctus et I. uxor eius tenuerunt . . . quasdam terras et quedam tenementa in Stanhowe et Causton . . .; que quidem terre et tenementa tenentur de nobis in capite per seruicium custodiendi unum bercellum nostrum cum nos bercellum illum ibidem ad custodiendum mittere uoluerimus (*Close Roll* 132, *m.* 26).

But the same serjeanty is thus described in *Testa de Nevill*, p. 299, *b*:

> De serianciis dicunt quod Willelmus le May tenet quandam in Stanho per seruicium custodiendi unum bracketum.

It is probable that the use of the word 'bersellus' instead of 'berselletus' on the Close Roll of 3 Ed. ii. is intentional, for on the Norfolk eyre rolls of 12 Ed. i. there is an entry concerning this serjeanty in which the word 'brachettus' is qualified:

> Dicunt quod Iohanna que fuit uxor Iohannis Kyng tenet quandam serianciam in Stanhow . . . per serianciam custodiendi unum brachettum deymeretum domini regis in capite de domino rege (*Assize Rolls* 573, *Rot.* 74 *d*).

Another case in which a bercelet is described as a brach is printed below under the word **brachettus**. The Close Rolls of the reign of Ed. ii. supply many examples of hunters being sent with a considerable number of running hounds (see **canes currentes**) and greyhounds to take venison; they were usually accompanied by a bercelleter who was in charge of one or more bercelets.

The following passage from the second part of the Patent Roll of 1 Ric. ii. is of some interest:

> Constituimus . . . I. L. magistrum canum nostrorum uocatorum berceletz . . . dantes ei licenciam expediendi eosdem canes necnon habendi et faciendi cum eis sectas ad quascunque bestias feras infra forestas chaceas et parcos nostros prout sibi pro expedicione et informacione dictorum canum pro deducto nostro fore uidebitur faciendum (*Pat. Roll* 299, *m.* 21).

The bercelet was probably a specially trained brach, which was used for finding the deer to be hunted. There can be little doubt that the words 'berserettus,' 'berselletus,' and 'berserez' represented the same kind of hound. On the 'Rotulus Misae' of 14 John 'brachetti berserez' are mentioned (see **brachettus**, below). In some letters close dated 1 September 1213, we have:

> R. de S., D. de N. peremdinantes apud C. . . . cum decem equis et xxij canibus berserettis et xviij garcionibus (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. p. 151).

In some other letters of October 1214, the following words occur:

> Et Hugo de Albin' [dat domino regi unum brachettum bon' berseret] (*ibid.* i. p. 173).

See also **bernarius.**

berserecii. These hounds are frequently mentioned on the 'Rotulus Misae' of 14 John. They are usually mentioned as having been under the charge of 'garciones' or grooms (Cole's *Documents illustrative of English History*, pp. 231, 232, 248, 253, etc.). In this roll no hounds called 'berselletti' are mentioned. As many different kinds are mentioned in this roll, it is probable that 'berselletti' and 'berserecii' were synonymous, more especially as the terminations '-cii' and '-etti' were interchangeable in the names of hounds. Thus we have 'daimericii' and 'daimeretti,' 'haiericii' and 'haieretti,' 'porkericii' and 'porkeretti.'

bissa (*M. F.* biche), a hind, the female of the red deer. Sometimes 'cerua' is used instead of this word.

blettro (p. 64), probably, a sapling of oak or beech. The word constantly occurs in forest documents, and seems to have been in use all over England, being applied both to oak and beeches. The

words 'blettrones quercuum' are not uncommon. Thus, in an inquisition at Hereford in 7 Ed. iii. we have:

> duas carectatas blettronum quercuum precii sex solidorum (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.* 258).
>
> plaustratum blettronum quercuum precii decem denariorum quos cariauit noctanter cum uno plaustro et sex bobus (*ibid.*).

On the other hand, the words 'blettrones fagorum' seldom occur, but we may take as an example the following passage from an inquisition at Salisbury in 46 Ed. iii.:

> duas fagas, precii ij sol'; . . . duas magnas fagas precii v sol'; . . . xxiiij bletrones fagorum precii vj sol', viijd. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 310).

There can be little doubt that the 'blettro' was not a fully-grown tree, as in the passage last quoted as well as in the ordinance of William de Vescy of 15 Ed. i., and in other cases, it seems to have been reckoned as of little value. Moreover, it is never mentioned in sales of timber.

The forms 'bletro' and 'blestro,' which occur on p. 68 above, are less common than 'blettro.' It is impossible in thirteenth century documents to distinguish between such forms as 'blectro' and 'blettro.'

bouiculus cerui. As to these words *see* **uitulus bisse.**

brachettus (pp. 5, 34, 99), a brach, a hound which hunted by scent. In the chronicle now called *Gesta Henrici* (Rolls Series, vol. ii. p. 180), we have:

> Eodem die rex Anglie misit Saladino leporarios et braschetos, id est, odorisequos.

An example has already been printed above, under the word **berselettus**, to show that a bercelet was sometimes described as a brach. Another example is afforded by the following entry in *Testa de Nevill*:

> Stephanus de Bello Campo tenet Cotes de domino rege in capite per unum brachetum cum ligamine (p. 18, *b*);

to which the corresponding entry in a list of knights' fees of the years 1284–1286 is as follows:

> Nicholaus de Segraue tenet Cotes pro uno feodo et pro uno berseleto cum ligamine de rege.

In the Rotulus Misae of 14 John (Cole, *Documents illustrative of English History*) the 'brachetti' are frequently mentioned as well as certain hounds called **berserecii.** It is not clear from the rolls whether these two words represented hounds of different kinds, or whether one of the words could apply to both kinds. There is, however, an entry in which 'brachetti berserez' are mentioned (*ibid.* p. 253). Both 'brachetti' and 'berserecii' were under the charge of 'garciones' or grooms (*ibid.* pp. 239, 253). It is probable that the 'berserecii' and the 'berceletti' were the same hounds and were specially trained braches. See also **berselettus** and **limarius.**

In the sixteenth century the English word 'brach' was used as the bitch of any kind of hound (see *New English Dictionary*, *s.v.* Brach); but there is no evidence of the Latin 'brachettus' having been so used.

The 'brachetti berserez' were not the only braches which were used for particular purposes in hunting. In some letters close dated 29 September 1275, we read of 'brachetti ceruericii' (*Close Roll* 97, *m.* 5). An example of the words 'brachettus deymeretus' has been quoted above under **berselettus.** There were also braches which were used for fox-hunting.

In some letters close dated 1 December 1213 we have:

> Mittimus ad te W. M. uenatorem nostrum cum quadraginta brachettis wulpericiis et sex leporariis et sex garcionibus et uno equo ad currendum . . . ad wulpem (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 156).

Although in the reign of John the 'brachetti' were distinct from the 'canes de mota,' it is possible that at a rather later period the 'canes currentes,' which were probably the same as the 'canes de mota,' sometimes included 'brachetti.' On p. 99 above we read of a person uncoupling some braches from his pack.

braconarius. This word occurs repeatedly in a Wardrobe Account of 18 Ed. i. (*Accounts, Q.R., Bundle* 352, *No.* 26). It appears to have meant a fewterer or person in charge of greyhounds and to have been used in place of the word **ualtrarius,** which is not found in the account.

brokettus, a brocket. In the later middle ages deer were called by different names according to their ages. Manwood states that a hart of the first year is called a hind calf, of the second a brocket, of the third, a spayard, and so on. In the thirteenth century a few only of these names were in use, and they had not then the meanings which they afterwards obtained. The special names for deer of one, two, and three years came into use before those for deer of a greater age, which latter, indeed, were probably only used pedantically. The word 'brokettus,' though used in the time of Manwood exclusively of a hart of the second year, was in the thirteenth century used also of the buck (pp. 92, 93, above), and the forest documents disclose no evidence as to the age which the word implied. An early example of its use is found in some letters close of 26 March $122\frac{6}{7}$ (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 178).

bulso (M. F. boujon, p. 1), a kind of arrow. Another form of this word is 'bosun' (p. 79), which occurs in *For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 82. The form 'bosoun' is also found in Britton. See *Britton* (ed. Nichols), vol. ii. p. 11.

The following passage occurs on the Dorset eyre rolls of 8 Ed. i.:

> Radulfus de Stopham tenet manerium de Bryxaneston' quod ualet xx libr' per annum per serianciam ad inueniendum domino regi quocienscunque contigerit ipsum habere exercitum in Angl' uel in Walliam unum garcionem differentem unum arcum sine corda et unum buzonem sine pennis ad sumptus suos proprios per quadraginta dies (*Assize Rolls* 204, *Rot.* 36 *d*).

In two inquisitions of a later date the word 'tribulus' is substituted for 'buzo':

> predictum manerium tenetur de rege per seruicium inueniendi unum hominem in braccis et camisia et nudum pedes per quadraginta dies sumptibus suis propriis in obsequium regis cum in partes Wallie profecturus fuerit habentem unum arcum sine corda et unum tribulum non pennatum tenentem maiorem finem dicti tribuli in manu sua (*Inq. post mortem, second numbers,* 24 *Ed. iii. No.* 30).

> que tenentur de rege in capite per seruicium inueniendi unum hominem in excercitu regis in partibus Scocie profecturi nudum pedes camisia et braccis uestitum habentem in una manu sua unum arcum sine corda et altera manu unum tribulum non pennatum (*Inq. post mortem, second numbers,* 27 *Ed. iii. No.* 40).

The M.F. 'tribule' is usually translated by the English 'caltrop.' According to the *New English Dictionary,* vol. ii. p. 43, the latter word was applied in Old English to brambles or buckthorn. The following passage, therefore, suggests that the ordinary translation of the mediæval Latin 'tribulus' may be 'buckthorn':

> de subbosco, uidelicet, spinarum corulorum et tribulorum in uiginti acris (*Accounts, Exch. Q.R., Bundle* 145, *No.* 5).

It is improbable, however, that the word 'tribulus' mentioned in the extracts from the inquisitions quoted above meant a shaft of buckthorn.

The syllable *tri* seems to point to an arrow head with a triangular cross section, that is to say, to a three-faced head.

The description of the serjeanty of Ralph of Stopham suggests that the 'bulso' or 'buso' usually had feathers on it. The stringless bow and the featherless arrow were probably emblems of office.

cableicium (p. 60), or **cablicium** (*M.F.* chablis), windfallen trees. Littré thus defines the corresponding word in the modern French:

> Le chablis est le bois que la force du vent ou quelque orage abat dans les forêts.

The word occurs frequently on the Close Rolls of 7 Henry iii. In the winter of that year a great storm burst over the country, which gave rise to a large

number of orders from the king relating to the fallen timber. It would seem from these and other entries that in the thirteenth century 'cableicium' was used of trees and not of branches, but the point is not clear. The word was still in use in the fifteenth century. On 3 March 144$\frac{4}{5}$ an inquisition *post mortem* was held at Oakham on the death of Anna Chiselden, and the jurors found that she died seised in her demesne as of fee of the wardenship of the forest of Rutland, 'una cum wyndfallyn' wode derefallyn' wode cabliciis. . . .' Another form of the word is 'caplicium,' which occurs in some letters close dated 2 September 1315 (*Close Roll* 138, *m.* 25). Similarly we have the form 'caplecium' in an ordinance of 4 February 123$\frac{6}{7}$ (*Close Roll* 49, *m.* 16 *in dorso*).

canes currentes, running hounds. Probably the earliest mention of these hounds in our public records is in some letters close dated 6 April 1205. Thus,

> Mittimus ad te R. B. cum octo leporariis et octo canibus currentibus et A. cum octo canibus currentibus, mandantes tibi quod eisdem R. et A. facias habere liberaciones ad se et ad equos suos, scilicet, cuilibet duodecim denarios per diem quamdiu ibi erunt per preceptum nostrum uel quousque aliud mandatum nostrum inde habueris; et leporariis facias habere cuilibet in die unum obulum et aliis canibus currentibus facias fieri brennum unde pascantur, nisi die quo current et pascantur coriata, ea die nichil habeant canes neque leporarii (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 26).

On the Rotulus Misae of 14 John the following passage occurs:

> Eidem H. ad inueniendas expensas tresdecim canibus currentibus ad lepus et tribus leporariis euntibus ad predictum R. (Cole, *Documents illustrative of English History*, p. 233).

This is the only case in the roll in which 'canes currentes' are mentioned.

It is probable that the 'canes currentes' included the hounds which in the time of John were described as 'canes de mota.'

canes de mota. An example of the use of these words occurs in some letters close of 6 January 122$\frac{4}{5}$:

> Mittimus ad vos A. E., R. P. et A. de N. cum uiginti canibus de mota et duobus leporariis ad capiendum . . . centum damos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 12).

An earlier example occurs in letters close of 29 August 1214:

> Mittimus ad uos G., N., W. et G. uenatores nostros cum septem equis et tribus bernariis et septem garcionibus et xlviij canibus de mota, mandantes quatinus eos currere faciatis ad ceruos et porcos inestiuatos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 170).

The canes de mota are frequently mentioned on the 'Rotulus Misae' of 14 John and also in a Wardrobe Account of 18 Ed. i. (*Accounts, Q.R., Bundle* 352, *No.* 26). The 'canes currentes' are not mentioned in either of these documents.

See also **cuerericii, cheuerolez, damericii, haericii,** and **porkerecii.**

capriolus (*M. F.* chevreuil), a roe. This word has the same meaning as 'cheuerellus,' which is merely a Latinised form of the French 'chevreuil.' A roe which was killed in the year 1251 is described in the forest inquisition (pp. 95, 96) as 'cheuerellus,' and in the corresponding eyre roll (p. 33) as 'capriolus.' The word 'cheuerilla' occurs in a record of 21 Ed. i. (*Placita De Quo Waranto*, p. 601).

ceppus or **cippus** (p. 48), the stump of a tree. This word, which is not uncommon, occurs in the Chapters of the Regard, which are printed in *Royal Letters, Henry iii.* (Rolls Series) vol. i. p. 347: 'quilibet ceppus de quercu et de fago.' The association of this word to the word 'eradicare' on p. 48 leaves no doubt about its meaning. Another passage in which the same association occurs is to be found in a Northampton forest roll of the year 1338. Thus:

> mandamus quod omnes cippos arborum predictarum in balliua uestra prostratarum non eradicatos numeraretis et euelleretis (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 102).

'Ceppagium' seems to have been used sometimes in the same sense as 'ceppus.' Thus:

> Clamat eciam habere ceppagia et escaetas de quercubus . . . .; set de ceppagiis nesciunt eo quod dictus R. et dictus I. ea eradicare non fecerunt (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 44, *Roll* 5, *d*).

ceruus (*M. F.* cerf), a hart, the male of the red deer.

cerucricii canes, or **ceruerettarii canes**, harthounds. The first of these words occurs several times in some letters close of 26 July 1225, thus:

> Scribitur constabulario de S. de magistro G. uenatore et I. S. missis cum canibus ceruericiis ad currendum ad ceruos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 53 *b*).

There are three similar passages in other letters close of the same date. Again in some letters close of 18 August 1227 we have:

> Mittimus uobis magistrum W. uenatorem nostrum cum canibus nostris ceruericiis et I. le F. et I. le Berner uenatores H. de B. . . . cum canibus suis ceruericiis et damericiis ad capiendum triginta ceruos et triginta damos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 198).

The 'ceruericii,' however, were not exclusively used for hunting harts, for in some letters close of 27 July 1225 the following passage occurs:

> Rex mittit G. et I. S. uenatores cum canibus cerueric' ad currendum in foresta de Deue et capiendum decem porcos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 84).

The form 'ceruerettarii' is used in the Close Roll of 16 Ed. ii., thus:

> Cum mittamus W. T. uenatorem nostrum cum P. W. lardinario G. S. et R. B. bernariis W. de F., I. R., R. de S. et R. de B. ueutrariis, W. B. pagio nostris et cum uiginti leporariis et quadraginta ceruerettariis . . . ad pinguedinem (*Close Roll* 147, *m.* 32).

In the fifteenth century the king had a master of his harthounds. Walter FitzWalter, for example, was appointed to the office in the reign of Hen. v. in succession to Sir William Bourchier, knight (see *Pat. Roll* 418, *m.* 10). On 28 January 143½, Henry Bourghchier was appointed by letters patent to the same office. In the letters patent the office is described as that of 'magister canum nostrorum pro ceruo' (*Pat. Roll* 432, *m.* 10), and in the corresponding letters of privy seal as 'maistre de nos chiens pour le cerf' (*Writs of Privy Seal, File* 964, *No.* 2457).

The harthounds were a breed of running hounds; for the letters patent dated 12 March 1405 by which Robert of Waterton was appointed master of the harthounds in succession to the Duke of York speak of 'officium magistri nostrorum currencium uocatorum herthoundes' (*Patent Roll* 374, *m.* 2).

cheuerellus, *see* **capriolus.**

cheuerolerez, hounds used for hunting the roe-deer. This word occurs in the Rotulus Misæ of 14 John:

> In expensis cc et xiij leporariis et xvij canum cheuerolerez qui sunt in custodia Ade uenatoris et xvj canum de mota qui sunt in custodia Blundell' uenatoris et xxv canum de mota qui sunt in custodia Ferling' uenatoris (Cole, *Documents illustrative of English History*, p. 247).

In the same roll we have:

> Ade uenatori et bernerio suo et xxiiij canibus capreolariis euntibus . . . uersus D. (*ibid.* p. 236).

In some letters close dated 29 August 1216, a certain hunter called Adam le Cheuerelez is mentioned (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 284).

cheuerones (p. 68), rafters. Henry iii. frequently directed the wardens of his forests to deliver 'cheuerones' to various people. These directions were enrolled on the Close Rolls, and in them it is found that the word 'cheuerones' is constantly associated to certain other words. Thus:

> viij postes, viij trabes, viij palnas, c cheuerones . . . ad quandam grangiam faciendam (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 65).
>
> c cheuerones, x postes, xii paunas (*ibid.* 104).
>
> vj postes tortos, cxx cheuerones de longitudine xx pedum et vj paunas (*ibid.* 106, *b*).
>
> xxx cheuerones, iiij trabes et iiij palnas (*ibid.* 137).
>
> lx cheuerones, x postes et xij paunas (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 597, 545 *b*).
>
> xij paunas et lx cheuerones (*ibid.* 529 *b.*, 536).
>
> xij postes et x paunas et lxxx cheuerones (*ibid.* 535, *b*, 536).
>
> iiij postes mediocres, iiij paunas mediocres, et xxx cheuerones mediocres (*ibid.* 540, *b*).

v gistas, j paunam, et xxx cheuerones (*ibid.* 542 *b*).

If these examples stood alone it might be assumed that the word was applied to a beam cut in a particular manner, and having a specific use; but this was probably not the case, as will be seen from the following passages on the Close Rolls:

lx cheuerones escapulatos et de alio maireno [*sic*] quantum opus fuerit ad domum suam de W. reedificandam (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 224).

lx cheuerones et x frusta [*sic*] ad paunas faciendas (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 528).

uendere . . . cheuerones de alno ad scalcofaga (*Close Roll* 66, *m.* 22).

When the king made presents of 'cheuerones' the number granted was always a multiple of five. On 26 July 1225 Hen. iii. sent letters close to the foresters in fee of Savernake ordering them to cause certain men of Marlborough to have 'cheuerones' for repairing their houses. Most of the men were to receive ten each, but some received fifteen, and others larger multiples of five (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 53).

See also **copule** below.

coerus, see **sorus**.

communiter (pp. 2, 3, 5). This word was ocasionally used at the beginning of the thirteenth century to qualify the word 'uillata'; but towards the end of the same century this usage had become obsolete. Thus, when some official transcripts were made at the end of the reign of Edward i. of certain documents of the reign of John, in which the words 'uillata communiter' in an abbreviated form occurred frequently, the transcribers read them sometimes as 'coniunctim,' and sometimes as 'conuicta.' See *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 249, *mm.* 1, 2, 13. In the original rolls these words occurred in lists of amercements of townships, some being entered thus 'de uillata de M.,' and others as 'de uillata de N. communiter.'

coporones (pp. 67, 124), the crop or lop and top of a tree. Usually the word was applied to that part of a tree which was not fit for timber, but sometimes the smaller branches appear to have been called 'escaete.' When the king gave an oak to anybody, the gift, unless there was a direction to the contrary, was understood to refer to the timber of the tree only, and the rest was, as a general rule, a perquisite of the warden of the forest or of a forester in fee. Thus it was found by inquisition in the year 1289 that the warden of Sherwood forest was entitled to have the bark and 'couporones' of oaks given by the king from his bailiwick. In this case there can be no reason to doubt that the 'coporones' included the small as well as the large branches; and the same may be said of many other passages where the word occurs (see *e.g.* p. 60). Perhaps the words 'cum escaetis' were added to show that the small branches on the side of the trunk were to go with the branches from the upper part of the trunk, the word 'coporones' being applied to the top and 'escaete' to the lop.

copule, couples. Henry iii. frequently made presents of 'copule' by letters close, enrolled upon the Close Rolls, and although it is clear that the word was applied to some kind of beam or rafter, its relation to 'cheuerones' is at present uncertain. But 'cheuerones,' was probably a general term which included 'copule.' The following are examples of its use:

xl copule . . . ad firmariam . . . faciendam (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 86).

xx copulas iiij trabes et iiij paunas, (*ibid.* ii. 86).

xl copulas ad reparacionem domitorii sui (*ibid.* i. 528, *b*).

cheuerones ad xxx copulas et in haya de la Lya corbellos et alia necessaria ad predictas copulas (*Close Roll* 43, *m.* 6).

couere (p. 81). This word probably meant brindled or streaked. It was applied to hounds in forest documents. Sometimes it was used without another adjective; thus:

cum tribus leporariis suis quorum duo erant couere et tercius albus (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 83, *m.* 8);

and sometimes to qualify an adjective,

such as 'rubeus,' 'niger,' or 'faluus'; thus:

> cum duobus leporariis, quorum unus erat fauw et pilosus et alius erat rubeus couere (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 132, *Roll* 6).
>
> cum duobus leporariis quorum unus fuit niger couueire et alter fauf uestitus (*supra*, p. 96).
>
> duos canes unum fauf couerre et alium griseum, qui uocatur Gower (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 5, *Roll* 9 *d*).

The expression 'niger coueratus' (p. 81) should be noticed in considering the meaning of this word. See also **tigrus** and **uerrus** below.

dama (*M.F.* daime), the doe, the female of the fallow deer.

damus, (*M.F.* daim) the buck, the male of the fallow deer.

damericii. This is an adjective used with the word 'canes' to signify buckhounds. An example of its use in the reign of Hen. iii. has already been quoted from some letters close of 18 August 1227, under the word **cuericii.** We also have in some letters close of 30 June 1213:

> mittimus ad uos W. de M. cum tribus hominibus et duobus equis et duodecim deimericiis et sex leporariis (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 137).

Again, in some letters close of 16 August 1215 we have:

> mittimus ad uos A. de C. cum duobus equis suis et quatuordecim canibus nostris daimmariciis mandantes quatinus ipsum cum canibus suis currere faciatis in B. ad danmos (*ibid.* i. 225).

And in other letters close of 29 October 1225 we have:

> cum canibus deimericiis ad currendum ad damos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 84).

On the Berkshire eyre rolls of 12 Ed. i. the following entry occurs:

> Willelmus Louel tenet duas carucatas terre de domino rege apud Benham per serianciam custodiendi unam meutam deymiterorum canum (*Assize Rolls*, *No.* 46, *Roll* 5 *d*).

As a rule the words 'canes damericii' were used only of a particular breed of running hounds used for buck hunting. From an early date, however, the manor of Little Weldon in Northamptonshire was held by the service of keeping the king's 'canes damericii,' and it is probable that in this case, which is an exceptional one, they were a pack consisting partly of running hounds and partly of greyhounds. Undoubtedly in the reign of Hen. vi. the word buckhounds included both greyhounds and running hounds, for in 27 Hen. vi. the lord of the manor of Little Weldon presented a petition in parliament in which the following passage occurs:

> Forasmuche that he holdith of you . . . the manoir of Lityll Weldon in the counte of Norhamt' by Graunte Sergeaunte, that is to witte, to be maister of your Bukhoundes and to kepe xxiiij rennyng houndes and vj grehoundes (*Rolls of Parliament*, vol. v. p. 167, *b*).

deductus (*F.* déduit), game. By the letters patent dated 27 January 141$\frac{5}{6}$ appointing a justice of the forest south of Trent (*Pat. Roll* 399, *m.* 12) he was also appointed 'magister deductus.' With three exceptions all subsequent holders of the office were appointed 'magistri deductus' which was translated, as soon as the letters patent began to be written in English, as 'master of the game.' An early instance of the word occurs in the Patent Roll of 19 Ed. i. (*Pat. Roll* 109, *m.* 23) but in the corresponding Calendar of Patent Rolls (p. 413) it is wrongly translated as 'decoy.' An earlier form is 'deduccio,' which occurs in the Close Roll of 36 Hen. iii. thus:

> facere septem trencheyas . . . ad deducciones regis (*Close Roll* 66, *m.* 24).

escapium (p. 64), money paid for beasts escaping into forbidden enclosures. The payments varied in different places. A full account of the payments enforced in a bailiwick in the forest of Peek is found on the Derby forest eyre rolls of 13 Ed. i.:

> Tota Campania infra metas suas est in defenso per totum annum; et similiter Eydal'; ita quod nemo habet communam nec accessum in eadem cum aueriis. Et si aueria uel animalia ibidem uenerint per eschapium, dabitur pro eisdem,

T

uidelicet, pro affro ij den', pro boue j den' et pro quinque ouibus j den', etsi hec inueniantur bis infra duo placita attachiamentorum foreste, quod si tercio inueniantur infra duo attachiamenta tunc debent appreciari ad opus regis, uidelicet, affrum prout ualet, bos ad sex solidos uacca ad quinque solidos et reliqui auerii [*sic*] minoris precii ad quatuor solidos et reliqui auerii infra duos annos ad duos solidos; et onis ad xij den': et porcus superannatus ad xij den' (*Duchy of Lancaster*, *For. Proc.*, *Bundle* 1, *No.* 5, *Roll* 15 *d.*).

faluus (*M. F.* fauve), fallow. In the forest rolls this word is frequently used of greyhounds and other dogs. It was also used of horses. In a roll of forest inquisitions of 19 to 21 Ed. i. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 82), we also have 'iumentum fauum.' The forms 'fauf' (p. 96), 'fauw' and 'fauwe,' are also found occasionally, the last two occurring in the Nottingham eyre roll of 8 Ed. iii. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 132, *Roll* 6). The compound adjectives 'fauf uestitus' (p. 96) and 'faluus ruffus' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 127, *Roll* 6) deserve notice.

fermisona, the season of hunting the hind and the doe. It extended from 11 November to 2 February. The following is an extract from a fine levied at Lichfield on 3 February 124$\frac{7}{8}$:

> Capere in predicto parco unam damam in fermisona inter festum sancti Martini et Purificacionem beate Marie (*Feet of Fines*, *Stafford*, *File* 5, *No.* 28).

In some letters close of 6 October 1310 we have:

> cum mittamus dilectum uallettum . . . ad capiendum . . . quadraginta damas de instanti seisona fermesonis (*Close Roll* 133, *m.* 21).

An undated document, a chirograph between William, earl de Warenne, and John of Thornhill, contains the following:

> Idem comes concessit eidem Iohanni et heredibus suis libere capere per annum quinque ceruos de pinguedine et quinque bissas in fermisione (*Ancient Deeds*, *A.* 317).

Another form of the same word was 'fermacio' (see *For. Proc. Tr. of Rec.*, 83, *m.* 4).

See also **pinguedo**.

feto (*M. F.* faon), a fawn. 'Fhoon,' 'feon' and 'faon,' all treated as nouns of the third declension, are forms of this word. It is used of both sexes:

> octo faones masculi et duodecim femelle (*Close Roll* 61, *m.* 6).

It is also used of the red and fallow deer alike: thus, 'feto dami' (p 82 above), and 'cum feonibus bisse' (p. 62 above). Also:

> uiginti et quatuor feones, uidelicet medietatem bissarum et aliam medietatem damarum (*Close Roll* 142, *m.* 19).

Apparently it is not necessarily a beast of less than a year old, for we have the expression 'feto unius anni' (p. 106 above).

fleck (*M. F.* flèche), a fletch. This word seems to have denoted a particular part of an arrow. Thus we have 'duas sagittas barbatas sine fleck' (pp. 94, 95), which are also described as 'due sagitte fracte.' The fletch would be the wooden part of the arrow, on which the metal head and the feathers were fixed. In the *Huntingdon Feet of Fines*, File 11, No. 220, we have the words 'una fleccha pennata.' Perhaps a dart without a metal head was called a fletch.

The passages in which arrows are mentioned in this volume are collected together under the word **walisca** below.

fusta (p. 80). This word seems to have been applied to trees generally. It was not applied exclusively either to timber trees or to trees expressly grown for fuel, or which had become only fit for fuel.

> Uiginti fusta ad maeremium cum omnibus coperonibus et escaetis suis ad operaciones (*Close Roll* 65, *m.* 20).
>
> Quadraginta fusta . . . ad trabes et gistas (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. p. 595).
>
> Duo fusta ad buscam inde faciendam (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. p. 64).

That the word was applied to trees grown for fuel is also evident from the fact that 'robora' (the word usually applied to such trees) were sometimes referred to as 'fusta,' thus:

> Meminimus nos alias dedisse fratri R. quondam abbati de S. decem uetera robora non ferentia fructum uel folia . . . ad focum suum que nec dictus abbas nec

frater S. nunc abbas . . . receperunt. . . . Et ideo tibi precipimus quod, si ita est, tunc tot fusta quot eidem abbati aretro sunt de numero illo . . . habere facias (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. p. 590).

The same fact shows that the word was not applied to trees of a particular species, for 'robur' was used both of oaks and beeches: perhaps, also of other trees. This again is evident from the marginal note 'De fustis ad focum regis' on a close roll, to which the corresponding entry is as follows:

Mandatum est . . . . quod ob capcionem centum et quinquaginta quercurm et centum spinarum . . . . (*Close Roll* 65, *m.* 22).

Finally, the word was applied, not only to dwarfed trees such as 'robora,' but likewise to tall trees. Thus:

Quinque magna et grossa fusta et longa ad paunas faciendas (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. p. 522, *b*).

Duo fusta . . . ad duas uirgas faciendas ad trubechettum (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. p. 62, *b*).

genderatus (p. 77) and **genderese** (p. 96). These words are used of arrows. Nothing is said of them in Du Cange's *Glossarium*, and there is nothing in the context in which they occur to suggest a meaning. The letter *n* in both examples may be read as *u*, and the third *e* in the second form may be meant for an o, but the forms adopted in the text seem to be the true readings. In the absence of any evidence on the point it may be suggested that 'genderatus' is a Latin word formed from the mediæval form of the French 'cendrée,' which is defined by Littré as 'écume de plomb.' The word would then signify that there was a ball of lead at the end of the arrow to prevent too much penetration into the deer. The final *e* in the form 'genderese' is represented in the manuscript by a mark of contraction which may be a mere flourish. In this case 'genderes' would be an attempt at the French word.

haericii and **haieretti.** These words used adjectively with 'canes' denoted a particular breed of running hounds (see **canes currentes**). They are frequently mentioned on the close rolls of the reigns of Ed. ii. and Ed. iii. Thus we have:

Mandatum est . . . quod dicto W. de B. et R. S. uenatoribus quos rex mittit cum uiginti et quatuor canibus haierettis decem et octo leporariis duobus bernariis duobus ueutrariis uno bersellettario uno berseletto et uno lardenario ad capiendos damos (*Close Roll* 133, *m.* 1).

Although the words may be translated by 'harriers' the above example and many others show that they were principally used for hunting deer. Indeed the words 'haericii' and 'haieretti' seem to have no philological relation to the word 'hare.' Two manors were held of the king in chief by the service of keeping the king's harriers, namely, Alderbury in Wiltshire and Buckhampton in Berkshire. The following passages relating to these serjeanties are of interest on account of the spellings:

Seriancia Willelmi Herez in Alwardebir' pro qua debuit custodire canes hayerez domini regis (*Testa de Nevill*, 147, *b*).

Ricardus Hayerez tenuit unam uirgatam terre cum pertinenciis in Alwardebyr' per serianciam custodiendi canes hayerez domini regis (*Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii. 234).

Et Henricus de Heyraz tenet racione uxoris sue duas uirgatas terre in Alwardbur' de rege in capite pro inueniendo custodem ad canes heyricios domini regis (*Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii. 242).

Seriancia Willelmi de Heyrez in Alwardebur' pro qua debuit custodire in curia domini regis canes haeriez domini regis (*Testa de Nevill*, 146, *b*).

Item Radulfus Raher de Bothampton' tenet duas uirgatas terre de domino rege in capite per serianciam, scilicet, pro custodiendo uiginti et quatuor canes haerett' domini regis et percepit per dietam sexdecim denarios de domino rege (*Rotuli Hundredorum*, i 11).

Racrus de Bachampton' et Radulfus Hoppershort tenent tres hidas terre in Bachampt' de domino rege per serianciam custodiendi canes hayrar' (*Testa de Nevill*, 127, *b*).

On the Berkshire eyre rolls of 12 Ed. i. we have:

> Iohannes de Baa tenet duas hydattas terre de domino rege in Bokhampton, per serianciam custodiendi unam meutam caniculorum haerettorum ad custum domini regis (*Assize Rolls* 46, *Roll* 6 *d*).

The following is an extract from the letters patent, dated 17 July, 1461, by which John Lovel was appointed master of the king's harriers:

> Sciatis quod . . . dedimus et concessimus eidem I. officium magistri canum nostrorum uocatorum hereres . . . percipiendo . . . uadia pro uenatoribus nostris et expensis unius equi nostri et putura canum nostrorum . . . uidelicet pro uadiis unius ualetti barners quatuor denarios diurnos . . . et pro duobus ualettis barners pro utroque eorum duos denarios diurnos, et pro duobus ualettis ueauteres predictis pro utroque eorum duos denarios diurnos . . . ac pro putura triginta et sex canum currencium et nouem leporariis pro quolibet eorum unum obolum et quadrantem per diem (*Pat. Roll* 492, *m.* 5).

hynulus, the fawn of a hind or doe.

> quod dama cum hynulo suo possit intrare et exire (*For. Proc.*, *Ancient Chancery*, No. 14).

The word, of which the classical form is 'hinnulus,' was not used only of the fallow deer, for in the Nottingham forest eyre rolls of 15 Ed. i. we have the words 'hynulus cerui' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 127, *Roll* 2 *d*).

if or **yf** (pp. 79, 96), yew. In documents relating to the forest the Latin word 'taxus' was never used, but its place was taken by the French 'if.' The French word was also used by the English Chancery clerks (see *Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. pp. 96, 119).

iniare (p. 39), a medieval form of 'inhiare.'

kaceken. For an example of this word see **bernarius**, above.

laia (*M. F.* laie), a wild sow.

> decimam uenacionis nostre capte in comitatibus Noting' et Dereby, scilicet, de ceruis et bissis et damis et damabus porcis et laiis (*Rot. Cart.* 189, *b*).

limarius (M. F. limier), a limehound. This hound is occasionally mentioned in our public records.

> Ricardus de Aslakeby tenet duas carucatas terre in Aslakeby per seruicium aptandi unum limarium ad opus domini regis (*Testa de Nevill*, p. 368 *b*).

In the printed text the word is wrongly spelt as 'luuarium.'

On the Pipe Rolls of 4 Hen. iii. the following passage occurs:

> Episcopus Elyensis debet duodecim canes de mota et unum liemer' (*Pipe Rolls* 64, *Roll* 10).

In some letters close of 14 April 1221 we have:

> Mittimus R. P. cum xiiij canibus de mota et uno limerio.
>
> Mittimus ad uos R. de B. cum xvj canibus de mota et uno limerio et R. de R. de S. cum xiiij canibus et uno limerio ad currendum ad ceruum in oris foreste de C. (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 453).

And in some letters close of 18 February 121$\frac{4}{5}$ we have:

> Mittimus ad uos R. uenatorem domini E. quondam Elien' episcopi cum duobus hominibus et uno bernario et duobus equis et xviij canibus de mota et uno limario. . . . (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 188 *b*).

These passages should be compared with those quoted under the word **bersellettus** above. It is not improbable that the limehound and the bercelet were different names for the same animal. Littré thus defines 'limier':

> Grand chien qui sert à la chasse des grosses bêtes telles que le cerf, le sanglier etc. surtout pour les lancer hors de leur fort, ou pour achever de les tuer, lorsque étant forcées elles se défendent trop bien contre les chiens de meute. Le limier ne parle pas (*Dictionnaire Français*).

But the English 'limarius' of the middle ages may have been a very different animal from the French 'limier' of to-day.

lupus. The following passage taken from the rolls of the forest eyre in Derby in 13 Ed. i. is of some interest:

> Iohannes le Wolfhonte et predictus Thomas filius Thome Foleiamb' tenent unam bouatam terre que aliquando fuit

una seriancia assignata ad capiendos lupos in foresta . . .

Et quesitum est que iura pertinent ad serianciam illam. Dicunt quod nulla nisi terra tantum, et non debet nominari inter balliuas de Campan', set quod quolibet anno, uidelicet, tempore Marcii et tempore Septembris, debent ire per mediam forestam ad ponendas pegas ad lupos capiendos ubi fuerit accessus luporum eo quod illis temporibus non possunt lupi odorare terram fossam adeo bene sicut aliis temporibus anni. Et eciam ibunt in foresta tempore estatis circiter festum sancti Barnabe quando lupi habent catulos ad illos capiendos et distruendos et non aliis temporibus. Et tunc habebunt cum eis unum garcionem portantem ingenia sua. Et omnes erunt iurati et portabunt unam hachiam et unam gesarme et cultellum ad zonam suam et non arcus nec sagittas. Et habebunt secum unum mastinum non expeditatum et ad hoc edoctum. Et erunt ad sumptus suos proprios; et nichil aliud facient in foresta (*Duchy of Lancaster*, *For. Proc.*, *Bundle* 1, *No.* 5, *Roll* 14 *d*).

lutericii, otterhounds. In a Wardrobe Account of 18 Ed. i. the following entry appears:

Et Iohanni le Oterhunte pro putura octo canum suorum lutericiorum (*Accounts*, *Q.R.*, *Bundle* 352, *No.* 26, *m.* 4, *4th and 5th entries*).

Ed. iv. had a pack of otterhounds which, like the packs of harriers and buckhounds, was composed partly of running hounds and partly of greyhounds. By letters patent dated 18 July 1461 the 'office called oterhunt' was granted to Thomas Hardegroue for life. The letters patent contain the following recital:

Cum Thomas Hardegroue officium uocatum oterhunt a quinto die Marcii ultimo preterito hucusque occupauerit et duos leporarios et decem canes currentes in custodia sua per idem tempus habuerit (*Patent Roll* 495, *m.* 5).

mastinus, a mastiff. It is difficult to distinguish between the letters *u* and *n* in thirteenth century handwritings, but the word seems to be 'mastinus,' not 'mastiuus.' It should be remembered that the corresponding Modern French word is 'mâtin.' On the other hand, in an inquisition held at New Salisbury in 44 Ed. iii. we have the words, 'cum uno cane uocato mastif' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 318, *Fourteenth Skin*).

The spelling with the letter *n* is corroborated by Mathew Paris, who states that a legate *a latere*, Magister Martinus, was nicknamed 'mastinus' on account of his rapacity:

quem propter improbam rapacitatem suam multi magistrum Mastinum appellarunt (*Chronica Maiora*, Rolls Series, iv. 368).

The word mastiff in the middle ages may have sometimes been used of the bulldog, which belongs to the mastiff class; but in the thirteenth century it is probable that it usually denoted a dog resembling a modern mastiff. There is abundant evidence that the 'mastiff' was used to protect its master's property. Thus in the Buckingham forest eyre rolls of 1256 we have:

duo mastini . . . quos H. R. messor dicti abbatis solitus fuit ducere secum ad campum dicti abbatis custodiendum inuenti fuerunt dilacerantes unum soerum dami (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 2, *Roll* 1 *d*).

Numerous entries on the eyre rolls show that it was large and strong enough to kill deer, although it was certainly not used as a hunting dog. It was because it was capable of doing injury to the beasts of the forest, and was at the same time a possession almost necessary to the inhabitants of the forest, that they were allowed to possess them, provided that they were lawed: that is to say, provided that three claws were cut from the forefoot 'without the ball.'

The mastiff was also used for destroying wolves; see **lupus** above.

mota (p. 99, *M. F.* meute), a pack of hounds. Some examples of the use of this word will be found above under **canes de mota.**

ouiare (pp. 19 and 36), a mediaeval form of 'obuiare.'

palna or **pauna**. This word frequently occurs in the Close Rolls in conjunction with 'cheuerones' and 'copule,'

under which words examples of its use will be found in this Glossary. It also occurs occasionally in conjunction with other words used in building; thus:

> ii postes et ii paunas . . . . ad se hebergandum (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 65).
>
> v magna et grossa fusta et longa ad paunas faciendas (*ibid.* i. 522, *b*).
>
> vj postes et iiij paunas et iiij soliuas (*ibid.* i. 529, *b*).
>
> ij furcas et ij paunas (*ibid.* 539, *b*).
>
> v gistas et unam paunam et xxx cheuerones (*ibid.* i. 542, *b*).

peia (p. 95, *M. F.* piège), a snare. The form 'pega' occurs in the extract quoted under the word **lupus** above.

The words 'peia' and 'pega' are derived from 'pedica.' On the Pipe Rolls of 8 John we have:

> Et Waltero Lupario x sol' iij den' ad pedicas faciendas ad lupos capiendos (*Pipe Rolls* 52, *Roll* 27 *Dorset*).

percursum, the right of pursuing a beast from outside a forest into it.

> Habeat percursum suum, scilicet quod liceat ei persequi feram, quocunque fugiet, siue in forestam nostram siue alias donec capta fuerit (*Rot. Chart.* p. 12).

perticha (*M. F.* perche), the beam of the antlers of a deer. Under the word 'perche' Littré has:

> Terme de vénerie. Les deux grosses tiges du bois ou de la tête du cerf, du daim et du chevreuil, auxquelles les andouillers sont attachés.

Another form of this word is 'perchia.' Thus a letter to the king dated about 1220 contains the following passage:

> Et sumerant arcum suum cum sagitta sanguinolenta et perchias cerui sanguinolentes cum corio et quadam portione uenationis (Shirley's *Royal Letters*, Rolls Series, i. p. 83).

The reference to the original letter, which is nearly illegible, is *Anc. Corr.* iii. No. 106.

Again on the Close Roll of 9 Hen. iii., we have:

> Mandatum est H. de A. quod omnes perchias de ceruo quas penes se habet de foresta nostra que est in custodia sua habere faciat P.C. balistario ad nuces balistarum faciendas (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 50).

This last entry should be compared with another on the same roll:

> Precipimus tibi quod habere facias magistro P. Balistario dimidiam marcam pro nucibus neruis et cornu que emit per preceptum nostrum ad balistas nostras de Corf' reparandas (*ibid.* ii. 63).

pinguedo (p. 105), the season for hunting the hart and the buck. It extended from 3 May to 14 September.

The following is an extract from a fine levied at Lichfield on 3 February 124$\frac{1}{2}$.

> Capere in predicto parco . . . . unum damum in pinguedine inter festum sancte Crucis in Mayo et festum sancte Crucis in Septembre (*Feet of Fines, Stafford, File* 5, *No.* 28).

In an undated charter of Richard i. to the Templars, we have:

> tres ceruos in pinguedine ceruorum (*Carte Antique, RR. or* 49, *Entry* 12).

The word 'pinguedo' should be translated as 'grease,' the period during which harts and bucks were hunted being known as 'the time of grease.'

In some letters patent of 16 May 1384 we have:

> concessimus . . . duos damos de grees et duas damas de fermeson percipiendos singulis annis in seisonis (*Patent Roll* 318, *m.* 12).

The beasts hunted during the time of grease were sometimes called 'pinguedo.' See, for example, the first extract from the Close Rolls printed under the word **bernarius** above. See also **fermisona** above.

porkerecii, hounds used for hunting wild boars. The word occurs in the Rotulus Misæ of 14 John:

> Rogero Burnell et Bernerio suo et xvj canibus porkereciis per uuam noctem xiiij*d* (Cole's *Documents illustrative of English History*, p. 241).

In some letters close of 8 November we have:

> Mittimus uobis W. uenatorem nostrum et socios suos ad currendum in foresta de C. cum canibus nostris porkariciis, ita quod capiant in die duos uel tres porcos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 181 *b*).

In some letters close of 10 September 1214 a Radulfus de Porkerettis is described as a fewterer (*Rot. Litt.*

Claus. i. 173). In the Rotulus Misae of 14 John a certain hunter is called in one place Thomas de Porkerez and in another Thomas de Porkereciis (Coles, *Documents*, p. 253).

priketus, a pricket. The pricket is frequently mentioned in the Nottingham forest eyre rolls of 15 Ed. i. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec. No.* 127), and although the words 'priketus dami' and 'priketus dame' often occur in them, they contain no instances of the words 'priketus cerui' or 'priketus bisse.' From this it would appear that the word from an early date was usually applied to the fallow deer only. There, are, however, instances to the contrary. Thus, in the Nottingham eyre rolls of 8 Ed. iii., we have the expression 'prickettus cerui' (*For Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 132, *Roll* 6 *d*). Manwood uses it of a buck of two years old. It should be noticed that in a roll of inquisitions (p. 92 above) of 34 to 39 Hen. iii., the word is spelt 'pricard,' and this may be an older form.

regardator, a regarder. It should be noticed that in the forest pleas of the reign of John, the form 'regardor' is used. So too in the Charter of the Forest we have 'reguardores.' The earlier form was no longer in use in the thirtieth year of Hen. iii.

retropannagium (pp. 67, 124), after-pannage: that is to say, money paid by way of pannage for the agistment of pigs in the king's demesne woods after the termination of the ordinary pannage season. Usually a halfpenny a pig was paid for after-pannage:

> Dicunt quod idem I. habet retropannagium, ita, scilicet, quod quando dominus rex die sancti Martini accipit pannagium suum, omnes illi qui porcos suos habere uoluerint ultra illum diem sicut prius fuerunt in dominicis boscis dabunt pro quolibet porco dicto forestario unum obolum (*Rot. Hund.* i. p. 26).

robur, probably a pollard tree of any kind, but perhaps also a tree stunted by nature and not fit for timber. In the thirteenth century the king sent frequently letters close to the wardens of his forests directing them to cause divers people to have trees; they were usually described as 'quercus' or 'robora.' In the letters close the word 'quercus' was generally followed by the words 'ad meremium,' and 'robora' nearly always by 'ad focum suum.' This shows that the 'robora' were fit for fuel rather than timber. The word was used of oaks, for the expression 'robora quercus' is not uncommon. It was also used of beeches, for we have the expression 'robora fagorum' in a forest inquisition held at Clarendon in 35 Ed. iii. (see *For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 310, *skin* 10); and other instances of the same expression could be cited. Moreover, in an account of a sale of wood made in the year 29 Ed. i., we have a long list of 'robora' and six 'stubbs' and their prices, and at the end of it the words 'Summa quercuum et fagorum uenditarum' (*Accounts*, *Exch. Q. R.*, *Bundle* 147, *No.* 10). The six stubbs were sold for 3*s.* 4*d.* In some letters close dated 25 March 1278 the words 'robora castenearum' are mentioned (*Close Roll* 100, *m.* 11). These facts show that the word 'robur' was not applied to trees of a particular species, but to those of a particular growth or condition.

The king's gifts of 'robora' were often limited to trees in a particular state, thus:

> quadraginta uetera robora . . . . ad duos rogos (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* ii. 19, *b*).
>
> duo robora folia non ferentia (*ibid.* 92, *b*, 93, *b*).
>
> duo robora sicca folia non ferentia (*ibid.* 119, *b*).

These and many similar entries show that the word was used of trees which were, often, old, dry and leafless, a frequent condition of pollard trees. A passage which deserves special notice is as follows:

> buscam tam de subbosco quam de ueteribus roboribus cum frondibus et aliis escaetis suis ad duos rogos faciendas (*Close Roll* 65, *m.* 6).

In most forests when the king gave a tree to anybody the crop or top and lop, which were described sometimes by the Latin words 'coporones et escaeta' and at others by 'coporones' only, belonged

to the warden, unless there was an order to the contrary. In this case the word 'frondes' is used instead of 'coporones,' as if the latter were considered inappropriate.

The word 'robur' was certainly not used to denote the mere stumps of trees, for in a verderer's roll of 38 Hen. iii. we have:

> De cablicio; de uno robore uento prostrato (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 249, *Roll* 26).

Although 'robora' were usually given for fuel, there are instances of gifts for other purposes, thus:

> de pomeriis et ueteribus roboribus quantum necesse fuerit ad perficiendum rotas molendinorum regis . . . . et alia minuta ad molendina illa pertinencia (*Close Roll* 66, *m.* 20).
>
> sex robora ad scindulas faciendas (*ibid. m.* 15).

In the roll from which the last extract is taken, the words 'de quercubus datis' are written in the margin.

On a Northamptonshire forest roll of the year 1338, the form 'rouere' appears instead of 'robur' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 102).

rusca (*M. F.* ruche), a hive. Thus:

> ignem secum portauerunt et ruscam apum cremauerunt et mel inde asportauerunt et unam quercum combuerunt (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 83, *m.* 4).

sequilones. This word seems to have denoted dry wood. In the Huntingdon forest eyre rolls of 1278 we have:

> et eciam clamat sequilones in haiis predictis que possunt colligi a manu sine utensili ferreo (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 44, *Rot.* 5 *d*).

Again in an inquisition held on 8 July 1251 the following passages occur:

> Homines domini regis de Clyne et de Apetorp . . . consueuerunt habere seculones iacentes super terram quod manibus suis colligere poterunt.
>
> Homines de Geytington habuerunt . . . siccum quod iacuit per terram quod colligere possent manibus suis sine armis emolitis (*Inquisition post mortem*, 35 Hen. iii. No. 61).

sewel (p. 131). An English word meaning a scarecrow.

> Anythyng that is hung up is called a sewel. And those are used most commonly to amaze a Deare and to make him refuse to pass wher they are hanged up (Turberville, *Book of Hunting*, ed. 1575, p. 98).

sorbauzwan (p. 115), a sorel horse with white feet. The corresponding compound word in modern French is *saure-balzan*. Littré defines 'balzan' thus:

> *adj. m.* Terme de manège. Cheval balzan, cheval noir ou bai, qui a des marques blanches aux pieds.

And 'saure':

> *adj.* D'une couleur jaune qui tire sur le brun; ne se dit guère qu'en parlant des chevaux. Un cheval saure.

The word occurs in the Close Roll of 10 Ed. ii., thus:

> Sorus bauzanus dextrarius (*Close Roll* 139, *m.* 30).

sorellus or **zorellus**, a sorel. Manwood calls a buck of the third year a sorel; but 'sorellus' in the thirteenth century was applied both to the red deer and the fallow deer. Thus in the Nottingham eyre rolls of the year 15 Ed. i. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 127), we have 'zorellus cerui' on one roll (*Rot.* 3) and 'zorellus dami' on another (*Rot.* 5).

sorus, a soar. Other forms of this word are 'coerus' (p. 27), 'zourus' (p. 93), 'yourus' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 82), and 'szourus' (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 12, *Rot.* 4 *d*). Manwood (*Forest Lawes*, p. 43 v°) states that the soar is a buck of the fourth year. The word was undoubtedly so used in the sixteenth century and perhaps earlier; but in the thirteenth century it was applied to the hart as well as to the buck, for more than one instance can be cited of the words 'sourus cerui' (pp. 93, 105).

stablia (pp. 34, 44, 99), a besetting of a wood for the purpose of taking deer or other beasts. Other forms of the same word are 'stabilea,' and 'stablea.' The besetting might be made with men, nets, greyhounds, sticks and otherwise. The following examples illustrate some of the methods employed:

> Faciunt stabileam inter hayam de T. per unam leucam et dimidiam cum retibus (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 279, *skin* 7 *d*: *Cannok Forest*, 39 *Ed. iii.*).

Interfecerunt duas damas per stabileam cum leporariis et baculis (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, 310, *skin* 8 : *Inq. at Lindhurst*, 48 *Ed. iii.*).

Et fecerunt stableam inter forestam et forincecos boscos cum equis et hominibus (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, 318, *skin* 6: *Inq. at Marlborough*, 35 *Ed. iii.*).

Cum fere domini regis transeunt metas foreste usque in schaciam domini R. filii P., que se iungit foreste, protinus idem R. per stabelliam eas facit tenere in schacia sua et sic per stabelliam in parcum suum . . . fugare (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., Southants, No.* 161 *Roll* 8).

Uenit R. prior de O. cum arcubus sagittis et leporariis et cum tota libera familia sua et omnibus hominibus suis de uilla de C., quos fecit summoneri quod uenissent usque boscum suum de C. qui est infra metas foreste. . . . Et cum facta fuisset stabelia, que circuiuit totum boscum predictum et boscum de L., fecit predictus prior scrutare boscos illos cum canibus suis predictis, qui mouerunt tres damos (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 158, *Roll* 9 *d*).

staggard. According to Manwood (*Forest Lawes*, ed. 1615, p. 41 v°) a staggard is a hart of the fourth year. The word occurs in an inquisition held at Somerton on 16 June 1368, and is there spelt 'stagard' (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, 309, *skin* 12). The word was not in use in the thirteenth century.

staggus, a stag. Manwood defines a stag as a hart of the fifth year (*Forest Lawes*, ed. 1615, p 41 v°). On the rolls of the Cumberland eyre of 1285 the words 'unus staggus bisse' occur (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec.*, 5, *Roll* 10). And in some letters patent of 4 October 1341 we have 'unus staggus unius cerui' (*Patent Roll* 206, *m.* 7) ; and in a forest inquisition of 21 April 1341 the words 'staggus cerui' occur (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 317).

strakare, to bolt, to run off in a straight line.

permiserunt leporarios suos currere ad unum leporem. Et leporarii sui strakauerunt et ceperunt unum feonem (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 5, *Roll* 10 *d*).

strakur. This word seems to have been applied to dogs used for poaching. It occurs several times in the Cumberland forest eyre rolls of 15 Ed. i. (*For. Proc., Tr. of Rec., No.* 5).

per unum strakur faluum (*Roll* 5).

cum uno stracur nigro (*Roll* 5).

cum duobus leporariis . . . et cum uno strakur griseo (*Roll* 7 *d*).

strakur (*Roll* 10).

cum duobus leporariis strakurs (*Roll* 12 *d*).

stub. In modern English this word is applied to a stump from which underwood is grown; but it was probably used of pollard trees in the middle ages. In the prices of vert for which the verderers accounted in the Nottingham forest eyre of 1334, that of the stub is too high for it to refer to a stump which could be of little value. It should be noticed, too, that the word 'robur' which probably meant pollard, is not found in this list. There is a parcel of documents at the Record Office labelled 'Augmentations, Accounts of Woods, One Parcel, Hen. viij.' It contains a book in manuscript with a paper cover, entituled 'Presentmentes of the preservators of woodis. De tempore regine Elizabethe.' In this book at f. 3 r°, we have :

one stubbe wherin was one tonne and a half of tymber, the which we counte altogether worthe iij*s.* iiij*d.*;

and again on the same folio :

one stubbe the which was broken a littell before havinge therin ij tonnes of tymber which we count worth v*s.* the tonne and also the brushe of the same tree iiij^or lodes of fewell wood which we esteme worthe viij*d.* the tonne.

On f. 78 r° of the same book, we have :

one grene stubb oke.

The words 'robur' and 'stub' both occur in the account of the year 29 Ed. i. mentioned under **robur** above. It is clear, therefore, that the two words had not precisely the same meaning.

tarrera (p. 122 ; *M. F.* tarière), an auger. In the inquisition held in the year 1266 printed on p. 121 above, a particular kind

of auger is described as a 'restnauegar.' It will be remembered that the word auger formerly had an initial *n* (see Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary*), so that 'restnauegar' is equivalent to 'rest-auger.' Two passages similar to the one in which the word occurs in the above-mentioned inquisition will be found in the Hundred Rolls (*Rot. Hund.* i. 22, 26); but they have been wrongly transcribed and printed. The true readings are printed on p. 122 above.

tena (p. 78), a cap.

> dicunt . . . . quod Reginaldus [Dingge] uenit in quadam grangia et uoluit luctare cum predicto Roberto, ipso Roberto inuito, ita quod cepit ipsum et ipsum prostrauit ad terram et tenam suam de capite suo cepit et in luto proiecit (*Coram Rege Rolls* 106, *Rot.* 2).

teyngre (pp. 80, 81, 90, 97). The meaning of this word is probably 'tawny. It is usually represented by its first five letters and a superior *e* which may be taken to denote the letters *re*; in one case, however, it is written in an extended form as 'teyngres' (p. 97). Even with the aid of philological evidence, it is difficult to assign a meaning to this word. It was seldom used, and only of the colour of greyhounds. The colours of these animals are often mentioned in the forest rolls; they are few in number. The plain ones are 'faluus,' 'rubeus,' 'ruffus,' 'niger' and 'albus.' Four combinations of colours are also mentioned, namely, **techele** or **techelatus**, **coueire**, **tigrus** and **uerrus**, examples of the use of which are printed in this Glossary. It is probable that 'teyngre' was a plain colour differing slightly both from 'rubeus' and 'ruffus.' These three words evidently represented different colours, for they are all three used in the same roll (see pp. 96, 97, 103, above). The following passage occurs in an eyre roll of 15 Ed. i.:

> cum duobus leporariis quorum unus erat albus et alius niger taunatus (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 76, *Rot.* 13.

If 'taunatus' represents a Latin form of 'teyngre' its association to 'niger' is exceptional. It should be compared with 'niger coueratus,' 'rubeus couere' and 'faluus ruffus.' See **couere** and **faluus** above.

tesare (pp. 5, 73), **thesare** (p. 77), to worry. The word was in constant use in the thirteenth century to describe the worrying of deer by dogs.

tetchelatus (p. 77), ticked. The form 'techele' is also used. Thus:

> cum quatuor leporariis quorum duo fuerunt nigri, unus albus, et unus techele (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 132, *Roll* 5 *d*).
>
> duos leporarios quorum quidam fuit albus, et alter tetchele (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 128, *skin* 2).

tigrus (*M. F.* tigré), tiger marked. This word occurs several times in a roll of forest inquisitions of the years 16 to 18 Ed. i. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 128).

> cum uno leporario tigro (*skin* 2).
>
> cum leporariis quorum unus tig' et alter faluus (*ibid.*).
>
> cepit unum leporarium tigrum (*skin* 3).

It should be observed that no particular colours are mentioned.

trenchia, or **trenchea** (p. 30). In the thirteenth century this word was not used of a ditch or furrow. It seems to have denoted a long and narrow clearing in a wood. Thus:

> facte fuerunt due trenchee . . . uidelicet, una de quercubus et subbosco et altera de subbosco tantum. . . . Et fuerunt uenditores et receptores . . . qui respondunt . . . (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 76, *Rot.* 8).

In some letters patent dated 20 November 1316, we have:

> concessimus . . . quod ipse quandam trencheam quadraginta acrarum bosci . . . facere et arbores infra predictas quadraginta acras bosci succindere uendere et quo uoluerit cariare (*Patent Roll* 145, *m.* 7).

Again in the Hampshire eyre rolls of 8 Ed. i. the following passage occurs:

> Dominus rex precepit fieri uendicionem bosci in ballia M. de C., unde in bosco de D. facte fuerunt due trenche, uidelicet, una in longitudine et alia in transuerso. Et altera trenchea facta fuit in F. longitudine et extransuerso

(*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 161, *Roll* 15).

tribulus. As to this word see **bulso.**

ualtrarius, ueltrarius or **ueutrarius,** a fewterer, a person in charge of greyhounds. This word occurs in some letters close of 4 October 1205, thus:

> Mittimus tibi R. et W. de R. ualtrarios nostros cum undecim leporariis (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 53 *b*).

A few years later the following passages occur on the Close Rolls:

> Inueni duodecim leporariis nostris, . . . et duobus ueltrariis, qui illos custodiunt, racionabile estuuerium suum, et leporarios pasci faciatis de brenio auene (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 99, *b*).

> Tresdecim leporarios cum duobus ueltrariis (*ibid.* i. 154).

> Mandamus uobis quod . . . mittatis . . . leporarios nostros, quos habetis in custodia sua, cum ueltrariis (*ibid.* i. 157).

In an inquisition *post mortem* of the year 1302, we have:

> per serianciam inueniendi domino regi quando uadit in Wasconiam unum hominem uocatum uautrier ad ducendos tres leporarios domini regis quousque idem uautrarius perusus fuerit uno pari socularum precii quatuor denariorum (*Inq. post mortem*, 34 *Ed. i. No.* 37).

The king had packs of buckhounds and harriers, which comprised running hounds (see **canes currentes**) and greyhounds. The fewterers who were concerned with these packs were styled 'buckhound fewterers' and 'harrier fewterers' respectively. Thus in some letters close dated 25 July 1312 we have:

> Cum mittamus . . . W. de B., I. L. et R. L. cum duobus bernariis haericiis et quatuor ueutrariis haericiis et duobus bernariis daemericiis et duobus ueutrariis damericiis et uiginti et quatuor canibus haericiis et uiginti et quatuor canibus daemericiis currentibus et triginta leporariis ad pinguedinem . . . capiendam (*Close Roll* 135, *m.* 31).

ualtri. These hounds are mentioned on the Rotulus Misæ of 14 John. They were hounds of a distinct kind and were not the same as the 'leporarii.' This is apparent from the following extract from the roll:

> In expensis xlj ualtrariorum quorum quilibet habet per diem ij den' et quatuor leporariorum quorum quilibet habet per diem obolum et xv ualtrorum et xxj canum de mota quorum quilibet habet per diem obolum (Cole, *Documents illustrative of English History*, p. 231).

In some letters patent dated 20 July 1471, a certain Nicholas Key is described as 'ualettus ueltrorum nostrorum' (*Pat. Roll* 527, *m.* 18). In the corresponding writ of Privy Seal he is described as 'yoman of our leesh' (*Writs of Privy Seal*, *File* 834, *No.* 3235).

uermes (p. 65). This word seems to have been used of vermin. In *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, ii. 79, there is a petition in which the following passage occurs:

> Et habeant chaceam suam per totam balliuam foreste predicte ad lepores uulpes murilegos tessones et ad omnimodas huiusmodi uermes.

The original petition was a schedule to another petition to which the modern reference is *Ancient Petitions*, *No.* 7822. It appears that when the 'ancient petitions' were rearranged and indexed the schedule was detached from the petition to which it was sewn; and it is now no longer to be found.

uerrus (p. 74). The meaning of this word is very doubtful. It occurs in an Essex inquisition as the colour of a greyhound. It is possible that it means streaked or brindled. But it may well have been applied to a hound of irregular marking in more than one colour. It may have come through a French form of the Latin 'uarius,' a word which was used to describe the colour of a horse in some letters close of 4 December 1214 (*Rot. Litt. Claus.* i. 180).

uitulus bisse, a hind calf. Manwood applies the words 'hind calf' to harts and hinds of a year old. The words 'uitulus bisse' occur in a forest inquisition held at Farnham in 42 Ed. iii. (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 310, *skin* 18). In some letters patent dated 10 May 1341 we have:

quendam ceruum et uitulum unius cerui (*Patent Roll* 205, *m.* 8).

In the thirteenth and early part of the fourteenth century the word 'feto' was used to describe the young of both the red and fallow deer (see **feto**). The words 'bouiculus bisse' occur in an inquisition held at Lindhurst in August 1366 (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 310, *skin* 9). The words 'bouiculus cerui' occur in an inquisition held at Somerton on 21 February 136¾ (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 309, *Skin* 14). (See also p. cvii, note 2, above.)

walisca sagitta. This seems to be the same kind of arrow as the one described in the French tract 'La Court de Baron' as a 'Galesche' or 'galoche' (*Publications of the Selden Society*, iv. 35).

Particular kinds of arrows are mentioned on various pages of this volume:

sex sagittas, tres barbatas et tres genderatas (p. 77).

tres barbate et tres genderate (p. 78).

tres walecthis et unum bosun (p. 79).

cum duabus sagittis waliscis (p. 80).

flecka (p. 85).

cum quadam sagitta barbilata (p. 87).

cum arcu et sagittis et una sagitta valisca (p. 90).

duas sagittas barbatas sine fleck (p. 94).

arcus de if et due sagitte barbate et tres sagitte genderese (p. 96).

tresdecim sagitte walenses (p. 96).

unus arcus cum corda et septem sagitte barbate et una parua sagitta et quinque fleck' (p. 96).

unum arcum cum corda et uiginti sagittas walenses (p. 101).

cum arcubus et sagittis barbatis (p. 110).

wanlassator. The meaning of this word cannot be ascertained from the few passages in which it is found on the forest records. In an inquisition held at Brockenhurst in 38 Ed. iii. we have:

Et dictus canonicus fuit ibidem cum leporariis . . . ; et I. S. et T. le R. fuerunt wanlassatores et ductores leporariorum ipsius canonici (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 310, *skin* 1).

In another inquisition held at Alton in 45 Ed. iii. we have:

Item dicunt quod I. T. est communis wanlassator et adiutor omnium malefactorum uenacionis domini regis in foresta (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 310, *skin* 19).

Again, in an inquisition of the year 25 Ed. i., we have:

M. f. I. T. de T. et I. prepositus de eadem attachiati fuerunt . . . , eo quod dictus I. portabat unum arcum cum sagittis ad malefaciendum, et I. prepositus fuit eius wenlacour (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 83, *m.* 3).

In the Essex forest eyre of 5 Ed. i. the tenure of Henry fitz Aucher is thus described:

Henricus filius Aucheri est forestarius de feodo de dimidio hundredo de Wautham et non reddit firmam domino regi; set debet facere wenlac' quando dominus rex uenit in partibus illis ad fugandum in balliua sua (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, *No.* 12, *Roll* 21).

But in Testa de Nevill the description is as follows:

Ricardus filius Aucheri tenet per serianciam de asceindr' coram rege (*Testa de Nevill*, 276, *b*).

From an inquisition made in the reign of Ed. ii. we have:

et quociescunque dominus ad uenandum uenerit, illi customarii solebant fugare wanlassum et stabulum in fugacione ferarum bestiarum (Dugdale's *Warwickshire*, ii. 911).

And again:

et solebant amerciari similiter si non uenerint ad wanlassum quociens dominus ad uenandum venerit (*ibid.* ii. 912).

cum warda facta (p. 64). In the Chartulary of the abbey of Whitby printed by the Surtees Society, we have:

Et dictus abbas . . . dedit et concessit dicto priori et successoribus suis communam pasture . . . ad quinquaginta uaccas, cum legali earum secta trium annorum, ita scilicet quod pascere possint in tota pastura illa sine warda facta (*Surtees Society Publications*, vol. 69, p. 218).

In Miss M. Bateson's *Records of the Borough of Leicester* the following passage occurs (at p. 39):

et omnes insimul denarios qui capi solebant de singulis peccoribus et aueriis

in defenso Leycestrie pro escapura, ita tamen quod aueria illa uel pecora non teneantur in defenso illo de uarda facta uel consuetudine.

In the record of an attachment court held in the forest of Galtres on the 27th August 1289, we have:

Uillate de Silling' in misericordia eo quod porci sui capti fuerunt in dominico domini regis cum uardo facto (*For. Proc.*, *Tr. of Rec.*, 237).

The words 'cum warda facta' appear to mean 'with watch set,' and to refer to cattle which were deliberately placed in the forest and restricted from roaming at large. If the owners of cattle pasturing in the forest had been permitted to watch them, they would have appropriated for them the best pastures of the forest to the exclusion of the king's deer. As to this see *Acts of the Parliament of Scotland*, vol. i. p. 323.

The passages quoted above should be compared with the following extract from *Les bons usages . . . . d'Oleron* which is printed with a translation in the *Black Book of the Admiralty* (Rolls Series, vol. ii. p. 300):

Et non pero prez puys que il sunt fauche ne sunt il mie pasturau communau a pors ni a beste foyllant ne encore a nule autre beste par tau manere qe hon ifichet pau ou pres pur estachier la beste, quar si ele est trobee ou prise estachee au pau, ele deit rendre v sols de gage por guarde fete ou amander la male faite segont la codume dau pais avant dite.

The custom which was called 'wardefet' was probably money paid for permission to have beasts pasturing in the forests with watch set. The custom is occasionally mentioned in the Patent and Close Rolls of the reign of Ed. iii. with respect to the forests in the counties of Nottingham and Derby; thus:

ipsum R. pro aueriis suis infra dictam pasturam suam inuentis ad denarios pro quadam consuetudine infra forestam predictam que uocatur wardefet ad opus nostrum prestandos per uarias districciones compellitis (*Close Roll* 160, *m.* 24 *d*).

The same sequence of words occurs in some letters patent of 3 November 1339 (*Pat. Roll* 198, *m.* 15 *d*).

At a later date, however, the custom of 'wardefet' appears to have denoted the driving of the forest from time to time for the purpose of impounding cattle which ought not to be pasturing there. The following is the explanation of the word 'wardefet' as used in the forest of Galtres in the time of Hen. viii.:

Wardefett'. Item the seides tenauntes haythe been accustomede to dryve and pynde all the bounderz goodes fownding pasturing of the king his grounde aperteaning to his maiestes crowne euery thyrde Sonday betwyxt saynt Elenemasse and Michelmasse for the salve garde of the king his game and all persones that haythe right by graunte or otherwise whiche haythe common of pasture shall haue their catalles delyuerde withoute payng anye poncion for the same (*Chapter House Miscellaneous Book*, *No.* 77, fo. 10 r°).

yourus, a form of the word **sorus**.

zorellus, a form of the word **sorellus**.

zourus, a form of the word **sorus**.

zucha (*M. F.* souche), the base of the trunk of a tree with its roots.

INDEX OF MATTERS.

INDEX OF PERSONS.

INDEX OF PLACES.

BEDFORDSHIRE.

BERKSHIRE.

BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.

CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

CUMBERLAND.

DERBYSHIRE.

DEVON.

DORSET.

ESSEX.

GLOUCESTERSHIRE.

HAMPSHIRE.

HUNTINGDONSHIRE.

HUNTINGDONSHIRE—*continued.*

LANCASHIRE.

LEICESTERSHIRE.

LINCOLNSHIRE.

MIDDLESEX.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE.

NORTHAMPTONSHIRE—*continued.*

NORTHUMBERLAND.

NOTTINGHAMSHIRE.

OXFORDSHIRE.

RUTLAND.

RUTLAND—*continued.*

SALOP.

SOMERSET.

SOMERSET—*continued.*

STAFFORDSHIRE.

SUFFOLK.

SURREY.

SUSSEX.

WARWICK.

WESTMORELAND.

WILTSHIRE.

WORCESTERSHIRE.

YORKSHIRE.

Selden Society.

FOUNDED 1887.

To Encourage the Study and Advance the Knowledge of the History of English Law.

Patrons:

HIS MAJESTY THE KING.

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE DUKE OF CORNWALL AND YORK.

President:

The Right Honourable Lord Macnaghten.

Vice-Presidents:

The Hon. Mr. Justice Stirling. Sir Howard Elphinstone, Bart.

Council:

Mr. J. T. Atkinson.
The Hon. Mr. Justice Bruce.
Mr. A. T. Carter.
The Hon. Mr. Justice Channell.
Mr. T. Cyprian Williams.
Sir H. C. M. Lyte, K.C.B.
Mr. A. Stuart Moore.
Mr. R. Pennington.
Sir F. Pollock, Bart.
Mr. W. C. Renshaw, K.C.
Mr. Henry Attlee.
Mr. Chadwyck Healey, K.C.
Mr. F. A. Inderwick, K.C.
The Hon. Mr. Justice Joyce.
The Hon. Mr. Justice Wills.

Literary Director: Professor F. W. Maitland (Downing College, Cambridge

Auditors: Mr. J. W. Clark, Mr. Hubert Hall.

Honorary Secretary: Mr. B. Fossett Lock (11 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London).

Honorary Treasurer: Mr. Francis K. Munton (95a Queen Victoria Street, London).

Annual Subscription . . . ONE GUINEA.*

Persons becoming Members may subscribe for all or any of the preceding years of the Society's existence, and in that case will be entitled to a copy of the publications issued for each year for which they may subscribe.

Non-members can obtain the Society's publications from

Mr. B. Quaritch, 15 Piccadilly, London, W.

* In America, $5.18

Z

PUBLICATIONS.

The Volumes already published are

Vol. I., for 1887. SELECT PLEAS OF THE CROWN. Vol. I., A.D. 1200-1225. Edited, from the Rolls preserved in H.M. Public Record Office, by F. W. MAITLAND, Downing Professor of the Laws of England, Cambridge. With Facsimile. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

A selection from the earliest records of English criminal justice. These criminal cases throw much light on the manners and customs of the people; they illustrate the working of the ordeals of fire and water, and show how a substitute was gradually found in trial by jury. They are mostly cases of felony, but care has been taken to collect whatever throws light on the procedure of the Local Courts, the system of frankpledge, the organisation of counties and boroughs for judicial purposes, &c., &c.

Vol. II., for 1888. SELECT PLEAS IN MANORIAL AND OTHER SEIGNORIAL COURTS. Vol. I., Henry III. and Edward I. Edited, from the earliest Rolls extant, by Professor F. W. MAITLAND. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

A selection from the oldest manorial records. These embrace the whole legal life and much of the social life of a mediæval village; including land held on villain tenure, services, rights of common, personal actions for debt and trespass, leet and criminal jurisdiction, misdemeanours, the system of local police and frankpledge, trading communities, and the law merchant as administered at a great fair. The selections are from the rolls of the manors of the Abbey of Bec in 13 counties, of the honour of the Abbot of Ramsay in seven counties, his fair of S. Ives, and his manors in Huntingdon, and of other manors in Berks and Wilts.

Vol. III., for 1889. SELECT CIVIL PLEAS. Vol. I., A.D. 1200-1203. Edited, from the Plea Rolls preserved in H.M. Public Record Office, by W. PALEY BAILDON, F.S.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

A selection from the earliest records of civil litigation. These consist largely of actions relating to land, either directly, as in the various assizes, writs of right and of entry, actions for dower, &c.; or indirectly, as for feudal services, tolls, franchises, rivers, &c. Others do not concern land. The extracts illustrate the gradual evolution of the different forms of action, both real and personal.

Vol. IV., for 1890. THE COURT BARON: PRECEDENTS OF PLEADING IN MANORIAL AND OTHER LOCAL COURTS. Edited, from MSS. of the 14th and 15th Centuries, by Professor F. W. MAITLAND and W. PALEY BAILDON. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

This volume contains four treatises on the business of Manorial and other Local Courts, with precedents; and throws light on the procedure and pleading. To these are added some very interesting extracts from the rolls of the Court of the Bishop of Ely at Littleport in the Fens (principally during the reign of Edward II.).

Vol. V., for 1891. THE LEET JURISDICTION IN THE CITY OF NORWICH. Edited, from the Leet Rolls of the 13th and 14th Centuries in the possession of the Corporation, by the Rev. W. HUDSON, M.A. With Map and Facsimile. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

This volume deals with mediæval municipal life; the municipal development of a chartered borough with leet jurisdiction, the early working of the frankpledge system; and generally with the judicial, commercial, and social arrangements of one of the largest cities of the kingdom at the close of the 13th century.

Vol. VI., for 1892. SELECT PLEAS OF THE COURT OF ADMIRALTY. Vol. I., A.D. 1390-1404 and A.D. 1527-1545. Edited by REGINALD G. MARSDEN, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. With Facsimile of the ancient Seal of the Court of Admiralty. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

The business of the High Court of Admiralty was very considerable during the reigns of Henry VIII., of Elizabeth, and of the Stuarts, and played an important part in the development of commercial law. There is in the Records much curious information upon trade, navigation, and shipping, and the claims of the King of England to a lordship over the surrounding seas.

Vol. VII. for 1893. THE MIRROR OF JUSTICES. Edited, from the unique MS. at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, with a new translation, by W. J. WHITTAKER, M.A. of Trinity College, Cambridge, and Professor F. W. MAITLAND. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

The old editions of this curious work of the 13th century are corrupt, and in many places unintelligible.

Vol. VIII., for 1894. SELECT PASSAGES FROM BRACTON AND AZO. Edited by Professor F. W. MAITLAND. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

This volume contains those portions of Bracton's work in which he follows Azo printed in parallel columns with Azo's text. The use made by Bracton of the works of Bernard of Pavia and the canonist Tancred is also illustrated.

Vol. IX., for 1895. SELECT CASES FROM THE CORONERS' ROLLS, A.D. 1265–1413. Edited, from the Rolls preserved in H.M. Public Record Office, by CHARLES GROSS, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Harvard University. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

The functions of the coroner were more important in this period than in modern times. The volume supplies interesting information on the history of the office of coroner, on the early development of the jury, on the jurisdiction of the hundred and county courts, on the collective responsibilities of neighbouring townships, on proof of Englishry, and on the first beginnings of elective representation.

Vol. X., for 1896. SELECT CASES IN CHANCERY, A.D. 1364–1471. Edited, from the Rolls preserved in H.M. Public Record Office, by W. PALEY BAILDON, F.S.A. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

These valuable records, of which few have hitherto been printed, throw new light on the connexion of the Chancery with the Council, and the gradual separation of the two; on the early jurisdiction of the Chancery, its forms and procedure, and on the development of the principles of Equity.

Vol. XI., for 1897. SELECT PLEAS OF THE COURT OF ADMIRALTY. Vol. II., A.D. 1547–1602. Edited by REGINALD G. MARSDEN, of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

This volume is in continuation of Vol. VI., and covers the reigns of Edward VI., Mary, and Elizabeth: the period of the greatest importance of the Admiralty Court, and of its most distinguished judges, Dr. David Lewes and Sir Julius Cæsar. It illustrates the foreign policy of Elizabeth, the Armada, and other matters and documents of general historical interest. The introduction treats of the Court from the 14th to the 18th century, with references to some State Papers not hitherto printed or calendared.

Vol. XII., for 1898. SELECT CASES IN THE COURT OF REQUESTS, A.D. 1497–1569. Edited, from the Rolls preserved in H.M. Public Record Office, by I. S. LEADAM, of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

The origin and history of this Court have not hitherto been fully investigated. Established by Henry VII. under the Lord Privy Seal, as a Court of Poor Men's Causes, and developed by Cardinal Wolsey, its valuable records illustrate forcibly the struggle between the Council and the Common Law Courts; the development of equity procedure and principle outside the Chancery; the social effect of the dissolution of the monasteries and the raising of rents; the tenure of land; the rights of copyholders; the power of guilds; and many other matters of legal and social interest. The introduction covers the whole history of the Court to its gradual extinction under the Commonwealth and Restoration.

Vol. XIII., for 1899. SELECT PLEAS OF THE FORESTS, edited from the Forest Eyre Rolls and other MSS. in H.M. Record Office and British Museum, by G. J. TURNER, M.A., of Lincoln's Inn, Barrister-at-Law. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

The Forest Plea Rolls are very interesting and little known. They begin as early as the reign of King John, and consist of perambulations, claims, presentments and other proceedings (such as trials for poaching and trespass in the Forests) before the Justices in Eyre of the Forests. The present volume deals with the adminstration of the Forests in the 13th century, their judges, officers, courts, procedure, &c.; the beasts of the forest, chase and warren; the hounds and instruments of hunting; the grievances of the inhabitants, benefit of clergy, and other important matters.

Vol. XIV., for 1900. BEVERLEY TOWN DOCUMENTS, edited by ARTHUR F. LEACH, Barrister-at-Law, Assistant Charity Commissioner. Crown 4to. Price to non-members, 28*s*.

These records illustrate the development of Municipal Government in the 14th and 15th centuries; the communal ownership of land; the relations between the town and the trade guilds; and other interesting matters.

The Volumes in course of preparation are

Vol. XV. for 1901. SELECTIONS from the PLEA ROLLS* of the JEWISH EXCHEQUER, A.D. 1244-1272. By J. M. RIGG.

These Rolls illustrate a department of the history of English law which is at present very dark. The Justiciarii Judæorum, who had the status of Barons of the Exchequer, exercised jurisdiction in all affairs relating to the Jewish community, namely, in the accounts of the revenue, in pleas upon contracts made between Jews and Christians, and in causes or questions touching their land or goods, or their tallages, fines, and forfeitures.

Vol. XVI. for 1902. SELECT PLEAS of the COURT of STAR CHAMBER. Vol. I. By I. S. LEADAM.

The Records* of this Court consist of Bills, Answers, Depositions, and other proceedings. They are of great importance as illustrating both public and private history. None of the Orders or Decrees are known to exist. In the Report of a Committee of the House of Lords made in 1719, it is stated that "the last notice of them that could be got was that they were in a house in St. Bartholomew's Close, London."

Vol. XVII. for 1903. The YEAR BOOKS of EDWARD II. A revised text and translation. Vol. I. By Professor F. W. MAITLAND and W. PALEY BAILDON.

It is proposed to continue these Year Books in alternate years—1905, 1907, &c.

Vol. XVIII. for 1904. SELECT PLEAS of the COURT of STAR CHAMBER. Vol. II. By I. S. LEADAM.

Vol. XX. for 1906. GLANVILL. A New Edition. By I. S. LEADAM.

The following are among the Works contemplated for future volumes:

Vol. . SELECT PLEAS in MANORIAL and other SEIGNORIAL COURTS, Vol. II.

Vol. . SELECT CIVIL PLEAS, Vol. II.

Vol. . CONVEYANCING PRECEDENTS of the THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

There are several interesting sets hitherto unprinted. The mercantile transactions are very curious.

Vol. . The HISTORY of the REGISTER of ORIGINAL WRITS:

* For further information on these Records, see the valuable and learned "Guide to the Principal Classes of Documents preserved in the Public Record Office," by S. R. SCARGILL-BIRD, F.S.A. (London: Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1891.)

The Society has also contemplated the collection of materials for an ANGLO-FRENCH DICTIONARY, for which practical instructions have been kindly drawn up by Professor Skeat. The Council will be glad to receive offers of help in this collection with a view to future publication.

The Council will be grateful for any information upon the contents and custody of any MSS. which may be of sufficient interest to be dealt with by the Society.

All communications may be addressed to the Honorary Secretary,
Mr. B. FOSSETT LOCK, 11 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London, W.C.

Subscriptions should be paid, and Applications for Forms of Membership or Bankers' Orders and communications as to the issue of the publications should be made to the Honorary Treasurer,
Mr. FRANCIS K. MUNTON, 95a Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.
or, in the United States of America, to the Local Honorary Secretary and Treasurer,
Mr. RICHARD W. HALE, 10 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

June 1901.

Selden Society.

FOUNDED 1887.

RULES.

1. The Society shall be called the Selden Society.

2. The object of the Society shall be to encourage the study and advance the knowledge of the history of English Law, especially by the publication of original documents and the reprinting or editing of works of sufficient rarity or importance.

3. Membership of the Society shall be constituted by payment of the annual subscription, or, in the case of life members, of the composition. Form of application is given at the foot.

4. The annual subscription shall be £1. 1*s*., payable in advance on or before the 1st of January in every year. A composition of £21 shall constitute life membership from the date of the composition, and, in the case of Libraries Societies and corporate bodies, membership for 30 years.

5. The management of the affairs and funds of the Society shall be vested in a President, two Vice-Presidents, and a Council consisting of fifteen members, in addition to the *ex officio* members. The President, the two Vice-Presidents, the Literary Director, the Secretary, and the Hon. Treasurer shall be *ex officio* members. Three shall form a quorum.

6. The President, Vice-Presidents, and Members of the Council shall be elected for three years. At every Annual General Meeting such one of the President and Vice-Presidents as has, and such five members of the Council as have served longest without re-election, shall retire.

7. The five vacancies in the Council shall be filled up at the Annual General Meeting in the following manner: (*a*) Any two Members of the Society may nominate for election any other member by a writing signed by them and the nominated member, and sent to the Hon. Secretary on or before the 14th of February. (*b*) Not less than fourteen days before the Annual General Meeting the Council shall nominate for election five members of the Society. (*c*) No person shall be eligible for election on the Council unless nominated under this Rule. (*d*) Any candidate may withdraw. (*e*) The names of the persons nominated shall

be printed in the notice convening the Annual General Meeting. (*f*) If the persons nominated, and whose nomination shall not have been withdrawn, are not more than five, they shall at the Annual General Meeting be declared to have been elected. (*g*) If the persons nominated, and whose nomination shall not have been withdrawn, shall be more than five, an election shall take place by ballot as follows: every member of the Society present at the Meeting shall be entitled to vote by writing the names of not more than five of the candidates on a piece of paper and delivering it to the Hon. Secretary or his Deputy, at such meeting, and the five candidates who shall have a majority of votes shall be declared elected. In case of equality the Chairman of the Meeting shall have a second or casting vote. The vacancy in the office of President or Vice-President shall be filled in the same manner (*mutatis mutandis*).

8. The Council may fill casual vacancies in the Council or in the offices of President and Vice-President. Persons so appointed shall hold office so long as those in whose place they shall be appointed would have held office. The Council shall also have power to appoint Honorary Members of the Society.

9. The Council shall meet at least twice a year, and not less than seven days' notice of any meeting shall be sent by post to every member of the Council.

10. There shall be a Literary Director to be appointed and removable by the Council. The Council may make any arrangement for remunerating the Literary Director which they may think reasonable.

11. It shall be the duty of the Literary Director (but always subject to the control of the Council) to supervise the editing of the publications of the Society, to suggest suitable editors, and generally to advise the Council with respect to carrying the objects of the Society into effect.

12. Each member shall be entitled to one copy of every work published by the Society as for any year of his membership. No person other than an Honorary Member shall receive any such work until his subscription for the year as for which the same shall be published shall have been paid. Provided that Public Libraries and other Institutions approved by the Council may, on agreeing to become regular subscribers, be supplied with the past publications at such reduced subscription as the Council may from time to time determine.

13. The Council shall appoint an Hon. Secretary and also an Hon. Treasurer and such other Officers as they from time to time think fit, and shall from time to time define their respective duties.

14. The funds of the Society, including the vouchers or securities for any investments, shall be kept at a Bank, to be selected by the Council, to an account in the name of the Society. Such funds or investments shall only be dealt with by a cheque or other authority signed by the Treasurer and

countersigned by one of the Vice-Presidents or such other person as the Council may from time to time appoint.

15. The accounts of the receipts and expenditure of the Society up to the 31st of December in each year shall be audited once a year by two Auditors, to be appointed by the Society, and the report of the Auditors, with an abstract of the accounts, shall be circulated together with the notice convening the Annual Meeting.

16. An Annual General Meeting of the Society shall be held in March 1896, and thereafter in the month of March in each year. The Council may upon their own resolution and shall on the request in writing of not less than ten members call a Special General Meeting. Seven days' notice at least, specifying the object of the meeting and the time and place at which it is to be held, shall be posted to every member resident in the United Kingdom at his last known address. No member shall vote at any General Meeting whose subscription is in arrear.

17. The Hon. Secretary shall keep a Minute Book wherein shall be entered a record of the transactions, as well at Meetings of the Council as at General Meetings of the Society.

18. These rules may upon proper notice be repealed, added to, or modified from time to time at any meeting of the Society. But such repeal, addition, or modification, if not unanimously agreed to, shall require the vote of not less than two-thirds of the members present and voting at such meeting.

July 1901.

FORM OF APPLICATION FOR MEMBERSHIP.

To Mr. Francis K. Munton, 95a Queen Victoria Street, London, E.C.,
Honorary Treasurer of the Selden Society.

I desire to become a member of the Society, and herewith send my cheque for One Guinea, the annual subscription [*or* £21 the life contribution] dating from the commencement of the present year. [I also desire to subscribe for the preceding years , and I add one guinea for each to my cheque.]

Name ....

Address ....

Description ....

Date ....

[Note.—Cheques, crossed "Robarts & Co., a/c of the Selden Society," should be made payable to the Honorary Treasurer, from whom forms of bankers' orders for payment of subscriptions direct to the Society's banking account can be obtained.]

Selden Society.

LIST OF MEMBERS.

1898.

(* *denotes Life Members;* † *Members of the Council.*)

UNITED KINGDOM.

Alsop, J. W.	16 Bidston Road, Birkenhead.
Anson, Sir W. R., Bart.	All Souls College, Oxford.
Atkinson, J. T.	Selby, Yorks.
Attlee, Henry	10 Billiter Street, E.C.
Baildon, W. Paley	5 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Birkett, P.	4 Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.
Blakesley, G. H.	13 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Bond, Edward, M.P.	Elm Bank, Thurlow Rd., Hampstead, N.W.
Bond, Henry	Trinity Hall, Cambridge.
Brace, L. J. K.	c/o Lloyd's Bank, 16 St. James's Street, W.
Braithwaite, J. B.	312 Camden Road, N.
Brice, Seward, Q.C.	5 New Court, Carey Street, W.C.
Browne, G. F.	151 Cannon Street, E.C.
†Bruce, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Brunel, I.	15 Devonshire Terrace, Hyde Park, W.
Buckley, H. B., Q.C.	8 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Byrne, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Campbell, R.	5 New Court, Carey Street, W.C.
Carpenter, R. H.	Bank Chambers, Corn Street, Bristol.
Carter, A. T.	Christ Church, Oxford.
Chadwick, S. J.	Church Street, Dewsbury.
†Channell, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Charles, Sir Arthur	Chelsea Embankment, S.W.
Chitty, The Right Hon. Lord Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Clark, J. W.	Board of Agriculture, St. James's Sq., S.W.
Cohen, A., Q.C.	26 Great Cumberland Place, W.
Colville, H. K.	Bellaport Hall, Market Drayton.
*Connaught, H.R.H. The Duke of	Buckingham Palace, S.W.
Cook, C. A.	108 Park Street, W.
Coolidge, Rev. W. A. B.	Magdalen College, Oxford.
Cornish, J. E.	16 St. Ann's Square, Manchester.
Couch, The Right Hon. Sir R.	25 Linden Gardens, W.
Cozens-Hardy, H. H., Q.C., M.P.	7 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Crackanthorpe, M. H., Q.C.	1 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Cracroft, R. W.	12 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.
Crewe, W. O.	Central Bdgs., North John Street, L'pool.

Cross, W. C. H.	Bank Chambers, Corn Street, Bristol.
Cunliffe, R.	43 Chancery Lane, W.C.
Currey, C. H.	14 Great George Street, Westminster, S.W.
Cutler, J., Q.C.	4 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Danckwerts, W.	7 New Court, Carey Street, W.C.
Davey, The Right Hon. Lord	10 Queen's Gate Gardens, S.W.
Dees, R. R.	Wallsend, Newcastle-on-Tyne.
*Derby, The Right Hon. the Earl of	Derby House, St. James's Square, S.W.
Dicey, A. V., Q.C.	The Orchard, Banbury Road, Oxford.
Donnithorne, Nicholas	Fareham, Hants.
†Elphinstone, Sir Howard W., Bart.	2 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
†Elton, C. I., Q.C.	33 Chancery Lane, W.C.
Evans, A. J.	65 Chesterton Road, Cambridge.
Evans, Sir John	Nash Mills, Hemel Hempstead, Herts.
Farwell, G., Q.C.	10 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Fisher, H. A. L.	New College, Oxford.
Ford, J. Rawlinson	61 Albion Street, Leeds.
Fox, G. W.	14 Rochester Terrace, N.W.
Fry, The Right Hon. Sir E.	Failand, near Bristol.
Galpin, H. F.	4 George Street, Oxford.
*Giffard, Henry A., Q.C.	9 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Grantham, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Gray, W. H.	Ormond House, Great Trinity Lane, E.C.
Gray-Hill, J. E.	Liverpool.
Gruchy, W. L. de	12 Highbury Mansions, N.
Hadfield, G.	20 St. Ann's Square, Manchester.
Hall, Hubert	Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.
Halliday, J.	5 Holland Park, W.
Harris, D. L.	Downing College, Cambridge.
Harris, W. J.	Sittingbourne, Kent.
Harrison & Sons	59 Pall Mall.
†Healey, C. E. H. Chadwyck, Q.C.	7 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
*Heap, Ralph	1 Brick Court, Temple.
Hollams, J.	30 Mincing Lane, E.C.
Hudson, Rev. W.	15 Hartfield Square, Eastbourne.
Humfrys, W. J.	Hereford.
Hunter, John	9 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Hutchins, F. L.	11 Birchin Lane, E.C.
Inderwick, F. A., Q.C.	1 Mitre Court Buildings, Temple, E.C.
Jackson, C. S.	15 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Jacobs, Herbert	8 Fig Tree Court, Temple, E.C.
Jelf, A. R., Q.C.	9 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.
Jenkyns, Sir Henry, K.C.B.	3 Whitehall Gardens, S.W.
Jeune, The Right Hon. Sir Francis H.	37 Wimpole Street, W.
†Joyce, M. Ingle	4 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Kekewich, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
King, H. C.	17 Serjeants' Inn, Fleet Street, E.C.

†Lake, B. G.	10 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Latham, W., Q.C.	11 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Lawrence, P. O., Q.C.	4 New Court, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Lewis, Frank B.	11 Old Jewry Chambers, E.C.
†Lindley, The Right Hon. Sir N., M.R.	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Lindsay, W. A.	College of Arms, Queen Victoria Street, E.C.
Lister, J.	Shelden Hall, near Halifax.
†Lock, B. Fossett	11 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Lushington, His Honour Judge Vernon	Pyports, Cobham, Surrey.
†Lyte, Sir H. C. Maxwell	Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.
Macnaghten, The Right Hon. Lord	198 Queen's Gate, S.W.
†Maitland, F. W.	Downing College, Cambridge.
Marsden, R. G.	6 New Court, Carey Street, W.C.
Martin, C. Trice	Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.
Matthews, J. B.	6 Sansome Place, Worcester.
Mears, T. L.	9 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.
†Moore, A. Stuart	6 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.
Moulton, J. Fletcher, Q.C.	11 King's Bench Walk, Temple, E.C.
†Munton, F. K.	95a Queen Victoria Street, E.C.
Nash, E.	2 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Neilson, G.	34 Granby Terrace, Glasgow.
North, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Norton, H. T.	57½ Old Broad Street, E.C.
Oxford, The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of	Cuddesdon Palace, Oxford.
Palmer, F. Danby	Great Yarmouth.
Parker, Kenyon C. S.	13 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Parker, R. J.	9 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
†Pennington, R.	64 Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.
Poland, Sir H. B., Q.C.	5 Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C.
†Pollock, Sir F., Bart.	13 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Poore, Major R.	1 Carlyle Gdns., Cheyne Row, Chelsea, S.W.
Priest, F. J.	163 Canning Street, Liverpool.
Privy Purse, The Keeper of H.M.'s	Buckingham Palace, S.W.
Prothero, G. W.	2 Eton Terrace, Edinburgh.
Radford, G. H.	40 Chancery Lane, W.C.
Raikes, His Honour Judge	The Leat House, Malton, Yorks.
†Renshaw, W. C., Q.C.	5 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
Ridley, The Hon. Mr. Justice	48 Lennox Gardens, S.W.
Rigby, The Right Hon. Lord Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Rigg, J. M.	9 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
†Romer, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Ross, Dr. J. Carne	Parsonage Nook, Whittington, Manchester.
Royce, Rev. David	Nether Swill Vicarage, Stow-on-the-Wold.
Russell of Killowen, The Rt. Hon. Lord	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
Russell, C. A., Q.C.	2 Harcourt Buildings, Temple, E.C.
Rutherford, W.	3 Plowden Buildings, Temple, E.C.
Rye, W.	16 Golden Square, W.

SALISBURY, The Rt. Hon. the Marquis of	20 Arlington Street, W.
†SCARGILL-BIRD, S. R.	Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.
SEEBOHM, F.	Hitchin Bank, Hitchin.
SHADWELL, C. L.	c/o Messrs. James Parker, Oxford.
SHARP, J. E. E. S.	Public Record Office, Chancery Lane, W.C.
SLATTER, Rev. J.	Whitchurch Rectory, Reading.
SMITH, Vernon R., Q.C.	3 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
STEPHENS, H. C., M.P.	Avenue House, Finchley, N.
STEVENS, T. M.	1 Garden Court, Temple, E.C.
STEVENS & HAYNES	Bell Yard, Temple Bar, W.C.
†STIRLING, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
STIRLING, Hugh	11 Birchin Lane, E.C.
SWEET, Charles	10 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
THORNELY, J. L.	5 Fenchurch Street, Liverpool.
THORNTON, C.	41 Manchester Road, Nelson, Lanc.
THRELFALL, Henry S.	12 London Street, Southport.
TURNER, G. J.	14 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
TURTON, R. B.	Killdale Hall, Grosmont, Yorks.
*WALKER, J. Douglas, Q.C.	4 Brick Court, Temple, E.C.
WALL, C. Y.	New Exchange Buildings, Durham.
WALLIS, J. P.	1 Harcourt Buildings, Temple, E.C.
WALTERS, W. M.	9 New Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
WARRINGTON, T. R., Q.C.	6 New Court, Carey Street, W.C.
WATNEY, J.	Mercers' Hall, E.C.
WATSON, E. J.	St. John's Arch, Bristol.
WEBSTER, Sir R. E., A.G., M.P.	2 Pump Court, Temple, E.C.
*WELBY, Edward M. E.	Norton House, Norton, Sheffield.
WESTLAKE, J., Q.C.	River House, Chelsea Embankment, S.W.
WHITAKER, F.	Duchy of Lancaster Office, W.C.
†WHITE, His Honour Judge Meadows	42 Sussex Gardens, W.
WHITTUCK, E. A.	77 South Audley Street, W.
WIGHTMAN, A.	Bank Chambers, George Street, Sheffield.
WILLIAMS, T. Cyprian	7 Stone Buildings, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.
WILLIAMS, T. W.	Bank Chambers, Corn Street, Bristol.
†WILLS, The Hon. Mr. Justice	Royal Courts of Justice, W.C.
WILLS, W.	4 Paper Buildings, Temple, E.C.
WILSON, J. C.	Shelwood House, Oxford.
WOODS, Grosvenor, Q.C.	9 Old Square, Lincoln's Inn, W.C.

SOCIETIES, LIBRARIES, &c.

BIRMINGHAM:	
CENTRAL FREE LIBRARY	Ratcliff Place.
CAMBRIDGE:	
TRINITY HALL.	
DUBLIN:	
KING'S INN.	
GLASGOW:	
FACULTY OF PROCURATORS	88 St. Vincent Street.
MITCHELL LIBRARY	21 Miller Street.

Hull:

Public Libraries.

Liverpool:

Free Public Library.	
Incorporated Law Society	13 Union Court.
Tate Library	University College.

London:

Guildhall Library	Guildhall.
Gladstone Library	National Lib. Club, Whitehall Place, S.W.
Gray's Inn.	
Incorporated Law Society	Chancery Lane, W.C.
Inner Temple.	
Lincoln's Inn.	
London Library	14 St. James's Square, S.W.
Middle Temple.	
Public Record Office	c/o Eyre & Spottiswoode, Gt. New St., E.C.
Sion College	Victoria Embankment, E.C.
Society of Antiquaries	Burlington House, W.
Treasury (Parliamentary Counsel)	c/o Eyre & Spottiswoode, Gt. New St., E.C.

Manchester:

Free Reference Library	King Street.
Manchester Law Library	Kennedy Street.

Newcastle-on-Tyne:

Literary and Philosophical Society.

Oxford:

All Souls College.

York:

Yorkshire Law Society	Guildhall.

COLONIAL AND FOREIGN.

DENMARK:

Royal Library, Copenhagen	c/o Sampson Low & Co., Fetter Lane, E.C.

DOMINION OF CANADA:

Armour, Hon. Chief Justice	Cobourg, Ontario.
Proudfoot, W.	3 Queen's Park, Toronto.
Law Society of Upper Canada	c/o Stevens & Haynes, 13 Bell Yard, W.C.
Library of Parliament, Ottawa	c/o E. G. Allen, 28 Henrietta St., W.C.
University of Toronto	c/o E. G. Allen, 28 Henrietta St., W.C.

FRANCE:

Tardiff, E. T.	28 Rue du Cherche-midi, Paris.
Bibliothèque Nationale	Paris } c/o Th. Wohlleben, 45 Great
Bibliothèque de l'Université	Paris } Russell Street, W.C.

GERMANY:

Hübner, Professor	c/o W. Muller, 1 Star Yard, Carey Street.
Berlin Royal Library	c/o Asher & Co., 13 Bedford Street, W.C.

INDIA:

Nichols, G. J., Cawnpore — c/o Grindlay & Co., Parliament St., S.W.

NEW ZEALAND:

Williams, Mr. Justice — Supreme Court, Dunedin.

QUEENSLAND:

* Griffith, Sir W. — Brisbane.

SOUTH AFRICA:

* Finnemore, Mr. Justice — Supreme Court, Pietermaritzburg, Natal.

SWEDEN:

Royal Library, Stockholm — c/o Sampson Low & Co., Fetter Lane, E.C.

SWITZERLAND:

Universitäts-Bibliothek — Basel.

TASMANIA:

Tenison, C. M. — Hobart.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

California:

San Francisco Law Library — San Francisco.

District of Columbia:

* Fuller, Hon. M. W. — Washington.
* Gray, Hon. Horace — Washington.

Connecticut:

Connecticut State Library — Hartford.

Iowa:

Iowa State University — Iowa City.

Maryland:

The Baltimore Bar Library — Baltimore.
Johns Hopkins University — Baltimore.

Massachusetts:

* Abbot, E. H. — 50 State Street, Room 81, Boston.
Adams, Walter — S. Framingham.
* Ames, Professor James B. — Law School, Cambridge.
Beale, Professor J. H. — 13 Chauncy Street, Cambridge.
Bigelow, Professor M. M. — 209 Washington Street, Boston.
Brandes, Dunbar & Nutter — 220 Devonshire Street, Boston.
Gray, Professor J. C. — 6 State Street, Boston.
Hale, Richard W. — 10 Tremont Street, Boston.
Hill, A. D. — 53 State Street, Room 1033, Boston.
Holmes, Hon. W. — Court House, Boston.
Hudson, J. E. — 125 Milk Street, Boston.
Leveritt, George V. — 53 Devonshire Street, Boston.
Thayer, Professor James B. — 5 Phillips Place, Cambridge.

Boston University — 19 Somerset Street, Boston.
Boston Athenæum — 8 Beacon Street, Boston.
Boston Public Library, Harvard College Library — c/o Kegan Paul & Co., Paternoster House, Charing Cross Road, W.C.

MASSACHUSETTS—*continued.*

*HARVARD LAW SCHOOL	Cambridge.
SOCIAL LAW LIBRARY	Court House, Boston.
WORCESTER LAW LIBRARY	Worcester.

MINNESOTA:

YOUNG, Hon. G. B.	24 Gilfillan Block, St. Paul.
THE MINNEAPOLIS BAR ASSOC.	Temple Court, Minneapolis.

NEW JERSEY:

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY	Princeton.

NEW YORK:

ABBOTT, E. A.	55 William Street, New York City.
ASHLEY, Clarence D.	New York University, New York City.
BACON, Theodore	Rochester.
BRAINERD, C.	47 Cedar Street, New York City.
DAVIES, J. T.	58 William Street, New York City.
DIVEN, George M.	212 E. Water Street, Elmira.
GULICK, J. C.	132 Nassau Street, New York City.
HAND, Learned	224 State Street, Albany.
KEENER, Professor W. A.	Columbia College, Sch. of Law, N.Y. City.
KENNESON, T. D.	11 William Street, New York City.
LOEWY, Benno	206 Broadway, New York City.
MILBURN, J. G., Buffalo	c/o B. F. Stevens, 4 Trafalgar Square, W.C.
NICHOLS, G. L.	49 Wall Street, New York City.
STARBUCK, Henry P.	Columbia College, New York City.
STRONG, C. E.	36 Wall Street, New York City.
CORNELL UNIVERSITY LIBRARY	c/o E. G. Allen, 28 Henrietta Street, W.C.
LONG ISLAND HISTORICAL SOC.	c/o B. F. Stevens, 4 Trafalgar Square, W.C.
NEW YORK BAR ASSOCIATION	42 West 44th Street, New York City.
NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY	c/o B. F. Stevens, 4 Trafalgar Square, W.C.

OHIO:

CINCINNATI LAW LIBRARY	c/o W. A. Anderson & Co., 22 Main Street, Cincinnati.
LAW SCHOOL, CINCINNATI COLL.	Cincinnati.

PENNSYLVANIA:

BISPHAM, G. T.	1805 De Lancey Place, Philadelphia.
*GEST, John M.	400 Chestnut Street, Philadelphia.
SCHAFER, John D.	Pittsburgh.
SIMPSON, Alexander, Jr.	1,335 Arch Street, Philadelphia.
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE LIBRARY	c/o Y. J. Pentland, 38 West Smithfield, E.C.
LAW ASSOC. OF PHILADELPHIA	Philadelphia.
LIBRARY CO. OF PHILADELPHIA	c/o E. G. Allen, 28 Henrietta St., W.C.

VERMONT:

TAFT, The Hon. R. S.	Willston.

WASHINGTON:

SHEPARD, Charles J.	Bailey Building, Seattle.

WISCONSIN:

STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY	c/o H. Sotheran & Co., 140 Strand, W.C.

LOCAL SECRETARIES AND CORRESPONDENTS.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

LOCAL SECRETARY AND TREASURER:

RICHARD W. HALE 10 Tremont Street, Boston, Massachusetts.

CORRESPONDENTS:

ILLINOIS:

JOHN HENRY WIGMORE 710 Masonic Temple, Chicago.

MINNESOTA:

HENRY B. WENZELL 601 New York Life Building, St. Paul.

NEW YORK:

GORDON TAYLOR HUGHES 120 Broadway, New York City.

LOCAL SECRETARIES AND CORRESPONDENTS:

DOMINION OF CANADA:

W. McGREGOR YOUNG The Law School, Osgoode Hall, Toronto.

NEW ZEALAND:

F. REVANS CHAPMAN Dunedin.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO. LTD., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON